



PUBLISHED BY THE

VOLTA BUREAU.

# MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF IN AMERICA.

AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE RESULTS OF  
MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF IN AMERICA,

EDWARD ALLEN FAY,

VICE-PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF LANGUAGES IN GALLAUDET COLLEGE,  
EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN ANNALS OF THE DEAF



WASHINGTON, D. C. :  
GIBSON BROS., PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS.  
1898.



**VOLTA BUREAU,**  
**FOR THE INCREASE AND DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE RELATING TO THE DEAF**  
**WASHINGTON CITY, U S A**







# CONTENTS

PREFACE, by the Hon. JOHN HIRTZ ... ..

## INTRODUCTION

Aim of the present Inquiry...	3
Diverse and contradictory conclusions of previous writers.....	3-4
These diversities and contradictions due to insufficient data .....	4
Method of the present Inquiry .....	5
America the best field for investigation of the subject .....	5-7
The term "deaf" as used in this monograph .....	7
Origin of the present Inquiry... ..	7-8
Blank marriage record used for collecting data.....	8-9
Sources of information.....	9-10
Extent and value of statistics collected.....	10
Acknowledgment of assistance received .....	10-11
Practical value of the Inquiry .....	11-12

## CHAPTER I

### MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF, ONE OR BOTH OF THE PARTNERS BEING DEAF

Total number of marriages recorded .....	13
Number of marriages in each decade of the nineteenth century.....	13-15
Number of partners in marriage .....	15
Marriages excluded from tabulation because of lack of information concerning results.....	15-16
Marriages excluded because too recent to have produced offspring.	16
Number of marriages included in tabulation and number of children reported as born therefrom.. ..	16
Marriages of the deaf probably slightly less productive of offspring than ordinary marriages.....	16-18
Far more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary mar- riages.....	18-21
Far more likely to result in hearing offspring than deaf offspring .....	21
These conclusions in accordance with the generally accepted laws of heredity .....	21-22,

## CHAPTER II

**MARRIAGES IN WHICH BOTH OF THE PARTNERS ARE DEAF,  
AND MARRIAGES IN WHICH ONE OF THE PARTNERS IS  
A HEARING PERSON.**

	PAGE
The tendency of deaf people to marry one another .... ..	23-24
Reasons that have been assigned for this tendency . ....	24-27
These reasons inadequate to explain it . ... ..	27-28
The true explanation to be found in the mutual sympathy arising from similarity of condition ... ..	28-29
Marriages in which both partners are deaf somewhat less productive of offspring than those in which one partner is a hearing person	29-30
Not more liable to result in deaf offspring ... ..	31-32
Proportion of deaf children born to number of deaf persons married less where both partners were deaf than where one partner was a hearing person. .. .	32-34
Explanations that have been proposed for this phenomenon. .	34-35

## CHAPTER III.

**MARRIAGES OF THE CONGENITALLY DEAF AND OF THE  
ADVENTITIOUSLY DEAF**

Difficulty of determining with certainty whether the deafness is con- genital or adventitious . ....	36-37
Proportion of the adventitiously deaf married larger than that of the congenitally deaf .... ..	37-39
Marriages of the congenitally deaf .... .	39
of the adventitiously deaf . ... ..	39-40
of the congenitally and adventitiously deaf to partners congenitally and adventitiously deaf .. . .	41
The proportions of such marriages compared with conclusions de- rived from "the theory of probabilities".....	41-42
Marriages of the congenitally deaf probably slightly less productive of offspring than those of the adventitiously deaf.....	42-47
Far more liable to result in deaf offspring.....	47-54
This conclusion in accordance with the generally accepted law of heredity .....	54-55
The liability to deaf offspring even where both parents are conge- nitally deaf not due to the union of "like with like" .....	55-59
Explanations that have been proposed for this supposed exception to the law of heredity .. .	59-60
Reason why the law is not applicable to marriages of the deaf.....	60-61

The results of marriages in which both parents were adventitiously deaf compared with those in which one parent was a hearing person.....	61-62
The smaller proportion of deaf offspring where both partners were deaf still unexplained .. . . .	62-63

## CHAPTER IV

### MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF, ONE OR BOTH OF THE PARTNERS HAVING DEAF RELATIVES

The frequent occurrence of deafness in families . . . . .	64
Conclusions that have been drawn from this circumstance. . . . .	64 65
The possession of deaf brothers and sisters probably not a more important indication of liability to deaf offspring than the possession of other deaf relatives. ....	65-66
The proportion of deaf married persons having deaf relatives probably far larger than that of married people in general.....	66-67
Far larger among the congenitally deaf than among the adventitiously deaf . . . . .	68
The proportion of hearing persons having deaf relatives probably far larger among those married to deaf partners than among hearing persons in general ....	69-70
Reasons why hearing persons having deaf relatives marry deaf partners ...	70
Marriages of the congenitally deaf, considered with respect to the possession of deaf relatives .....	71-78
of the adventitiously deaf. . . . .	78-83
of the deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.....	84-87
The liability to deaf offspring greatest where partners have deaf relatives, however they are classified with respect to congenital or adventitious deafness .. . . .	88
Marriages in which both partners were deaf and those in which one partner was hearing, considered with respect to the possession of deaf relatives.....	88-92
The liability to deaf offspring greatest where partners have deaf relatives, however they are classified with respect to the deafness of one or both partners .....	92
All marriages of the deaf considered with respect to the possession of deaf relatives .....	92-94
The possession of deaf relatives a more important indication of liability to deaf offspring than congenital deafness .....	94-95
Marriages in which one partner was a hearing person considered with respect to the possession of deaf relatives.....	95-97

	PAGE.
Hearing partners having deaf relatives as liable to deaf offspring as deaf partners .....	97-99
The larger proportion of deaf offspring where one partner was a hearing person still unexplained ....	99-100
The possession of deaf relatives affords the key to the solution of the question of the liability of marriages of the deaf to result in deaf offspring .. .. .	100-101
The advice to be given the deaf on the subject of marriage ...	101-104

## CHAPTER V.

## CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF.

The results of consanguineous marriages in general.. .. .	105
The probable results of consanguineous marriages of the deaf... ..	105-106
Number of consanguineous marriages reported . . . . .	106
Various relationships between partners in marriage... ..	106-107
Consanguineous marriages of the deaf very liable to result in deaf offspring . . . . .	107-109
Dangerous, no matter what the character of the relationship,	109-110
Nor whether one or both partners are deaf .....	110-111
Nor whether the deafness of one or both or neither is congenital .. . . .	111-112
Nor whether either or both or neither have other deaf relatives . . . . .	112-114
The larger proportion of deaf offspring where one partner was a hearing person probably due to the larger proportion of consanguineous marriages in which one partner was a hearing person,	114-116
Further advice to be given the deaf on the subject of marriage .	116

## CHAPTER VI

## HAPPINESS

The general opinion that marriages in which both partners are deaf are more likely to result happily than those in which one partner is a hearing person . . . . .	117
Dissent from this opinion ....	118
The question cannot be settled by individual testimony and opinion	118-119
Divorces and separations as an indication of the extent of marital infelicity .. .. .	119
The proportion of divorces and separations far less where both partners were deaf.....	120-121
Reasons why such marriages are more likely to result happily. . .	121

CHAPTER VII.

SUMMARY OF STATISTICS AND CONCLUSIONS.

	PAGE.
America and Europe.....	122
The present century.....	122-123
Deaf and hearing partners .....	123-124
Productiveness.....	124-125
Deaf offspring (a) One or both partners deaf .....	125-126
(b) Both partners deaf or one partner hearing .....	126-128
(c) Partners congenitally or adventitiously deaf .....	128-129
(d) Partners having deaf relatives .....	129-132
(e) Partners consanguineous .....	132-133
(f) Summary of statistics .....	133 134
Happiness .....	135
APPENDIX A —TABULAR STATEMENT OF MARRIAGES. ..	137 499
APPENDIX B —BIBLIOGRAPHY ..	500-519
APPENDIX C —ILLEGITIMATE UNIONS .....	520 522
INDEX.....	523-527
ERRATA , .....	528



## PREFACE.

---

AMONG the charges which Dr. A. Graham Bell committed to the Volta Bureau, upon liberally endowing that institution, was that of promoting researches in regard to Marriages of the Deaf in America. This work had been systematically entered upon by Dr. E. A. Fay, Editor of the *American Annals of the Deaf*, who was peculiarly fitted for a task of such importance and magnitude.

Dr. Fay's undertaking this work as a labor of love was sufficient assurance that it would be conscientiously prosecuted, and rendered of unquestionable value as a basis for scientific deductions. To this end the resources of the Volta Bureau fund were placed at Dr. Fay's disposal, in order that the labor of presenting these statistical data might cover the greatest possible scope and leave nothing wanting that could be deemed essential.

The work of taking the Eleventh Census of the United States occurring during this period, and the Federal Government having appointed Dr. Fay its special agent for the collection of statistics relating to the deaf of the United States, it was thought desirable officially to supplement the census returns by details not provided for in the Government appropriations, as the additional data would prove of importance in the marriage researches then being made. To accomplish this, it was requisite to make liberal use of the Volta fund, although, in addition, much labor was generously given by numerous public-spirited deaf persons, and also by teachers, principals, and superintendents of schools for the deaf.



The result is that this Bureau can now congratulate itself, and all those interested in the cause of the deaf, in having secured through Dr Fay's untiring care material of inestimable value to the deaf, to science, and to humanity at large.

JOHN HITZ,  
*Superintendent of the Volta Bureau*

## INTRODUCTION.

THE chief aim of this Inquiry concerning the Results of Marriages of the Deaf in America is to find true answers to the following questions, which are of great interest and importance to the deaf as a class and as individuals, and also to society:

1. Are marriages of deaf persons more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages?

2. Are marriages in which both of the partners are deaf more liable to result in deaf offspring than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person?

3. Are certain classes of the deaf, however they may marry, more liable than others to have deaf children? If so, how are these classes respectively composed, and what are the conditions that increase or diminish this liability?

4. Aside from the question of the liability of the offspring to deafness, are marriages in which both of the partners are deaf more likely to result happily than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person?

Some other points, of minor interest and importance, will also be considered.

The questions above stated, especially the first and second, have been much discussed in Europe and America, as may be seen by referring to the extensive bibliography given at the end of this monograph. The conclusions reached differ widely. Some writers maintain that marriages of the deaf are far more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages, and that this liability is greatly increased when both of the partners in marriage are deaf; others maintain that such marriages are but lit-

tle more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages, and others that they are not at all more liable. As examples of the two extremes may be cited, on the one hand, the conclusion of Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, who declares that "the evidence shows a tendency to the formation of a deaf variety of the human race in America;"\* and, on the other hand, the conclusion of the commissioners of the Irish census of 1881, who say that "it appears evident that the question of deafness and dumbness in the parents has no influence in propagating the defect."†

The conclusions of Dr. Bell and of the commissioners of the Irish census are drawn from the statistics of different countries, but we cannot believe that the laws of heredity that hold in America do not also hold in Ireland; in fact, similarly opposite conclusions might be cited from numerous writers residing in the same countries, but dealing with different data. The cause of all these diversities and contradictions is that, on one side or the other, or on both, either the statistics upon which the conclusions are based do not include a sufficiently large number of cases, or they are not sufficiently full and accurate. The number of marriages collected by each investigator is comparatively small, and the details given are so meagre that even by grouping together all the statistics that have been published no conclusive results can be obtained. Dr. Holder Mygind, of Copenhagen, writing on this subject since the present Inquiry was begun, says: "It is impossible to make use of the numerous reports of single cases in which

\* A. G. BELL, "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," in "Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences," Washington, 1884, vol. II, part 4; Reprint, Washington, 1884, p. 45. Dr. Bell's conclusion is based chiefly upon the results of the marriages of former pupils of the Hartford and Illinois schools for the deaf, and upon the returns of the United States census of 1880.

† "Census of Ireland, 1881, Part II, General Report, Dublin, 1882," p. 44. The conclusion of the commissioners is based upon the returns of the censuses of 1851, 1861, and 1871.

deaf and dumb children have been born in marriages contracted by deaf-mutes, to prove the frequency with which such marriages produce deaf-mute offspring. It is only by collecting all the marriages contracted by deaf-mutes in a certain country or province into a group, and by investigating the number of these marriages which have produced deaf-mute children, and the number of the latter, that it is possible to arrive at reliable conclusions.\* This is the method adopted in the present Inquiry, and it is hoped and believed that the statistics collected include a sufficiently large number of cases, and are sufficiently full and accurate, to render the conclusions trustworthy.

In Europe as well as America, since the education of the deaf has become general, marriage has ceased to be rare among them; but in America, partly in consequence of the freedom from certain restrictions that hamper marriage more or less in most European countries, and partly on account of the more prosperous circumstances, and consequent greater ability to support a family, of the deaf of this country, the proportion of those who marry is larger than in Europe. In Denmark, in 1880, according to the census of that year, 23.7 of the adult deaf residing in the rural districts and provincial towns were married.† In other countries of Europe the percentage of the deaf who marry, as indicated by the meagre statistics that have been published, is considerably lower than in Denmark. In Magdeburg, in 1871, the percentage of

---

\* H. MYGIND, "Deaf Mutism," London, 1894, p. 46.

† H. MYGIND, "Deaf-Mutes in Denmark," in "Archives of Otology," New York, 1892, vol. xxi, p. 407. Information on this point was only to be had from the rural districts and provincial towns, as the census returns from the metropolis did not show the marriages of the deaf. Dr. Mygind's comments confirm the opinion above expressed concerning the less prosperous circumstances of the deaf in Europe and the influence of this fact in diminishing the number of those who marry. He says: "The returns prove the sad fact that nearly half [46.8 per cent.] of all deaf-mutes over twenty years of age are obliged to fall back upon the help of others. \* \* \* When this is the case in Denmark, where the

the adult deaf who were married was 12 per cent.;\* in Cologne, in 1870, it was 10 per cent.;† in Prussia, in 1880, 7½ per cent.;‡ in Bavaria, in 1871, 7 per cent.§ In the United States, 27,924 pupils had attended schools for the deaf up to the year 1890,|| and the present collection of marriage records shows that 6,460, or 23.1 per cent., of these have been married. Inasmuch as (1) many of the pupils included in the former statement are still in school, (2) some who have left school have not yet arrived at a marriageable age, and (3) probably not all who have been married are recorded, the true percentage of those who marry is much higher. Dr. Bell, inquiring into the number of former pupils of the American and Illinois schools born before 1840, found the proportion of those who had been married up to 1882 to be 45.4 per cent.,¶ and this rate is probably an approximation to the true percentage of the married deaf in the United States. This country,

public care of deaf-mutes is especially highly developed, what must it be in other countries, where matters concerning deaf-mutes are less advanced? \* \* \* The reason why comparatively so few deaf-mutes contract marriages must, in my opinion, be chiefly sought in this circumstance, that the men comparatively rarely attain an independent position to make a good livelihood."—*Ibid*, pp. 404, 405, 407.

\* B. F. WILHELM, "Statistik der Taubstummen des Regierungsbezirks Magdeburg nach der Volkszahlung von 1871," in "Beilage zur deutschen Klinik, Monatsblatt für medizinische Statistik und öffentliche Gesundheitspflege," Berlin, 1873, No. 9, p. 68.

† Dr. LENT, "Statistik der Taubstummen des Regierungsbezirks Köln, Bericht an den Verein der Aerzte des Regierungsbezirks Köln," Cologne, 1870, p. 20.

‡ GUTTSTADT, "Die Verbreitung der Blinden und Taubstummen," in "Zeitschrift des königlichen Preussischen statistischen Bureau," Berlin, p. 208.

§ G. MAYER, "Die Verbreitung der Blindheit, der Taubstummheit, des Blodsinns und des Irrsinns in Bayern," in "Beiträge zur Statistik des Königreichs Bayern," München, 1877, xxxv Heft, p. 29.

|| "School Statistics of the Deaf," in "Proceedings of the World's Congress of Instructors of the Deaf," Washington, 1893, p. 270.

¶ A. G. BELL, "Mémorial on the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," Reprint, Washington, 1884, p. 16.

therefore, offers the most abundant materials for the investigation of the results of marriages of the deaf.

The term "deaf," in its widest application, includes all degrees of imperfection of hearing. "Von Troltsch declares (and he has never been contradicted) that every third person between twenty and fifty years of age is more or less deaf, at least in one ear."\* There is reason to believe that slight imperfection of hearing is of scarcely less importance in connection with the question of heredity than total deafness, but, in order to bring the present Inquiry within reasonable limits and to render the calculation of percentages feasible, it was necessary to draw a line of demarcation somewhere. The term "deaf," as used in this monograph, invariably refers to the class of persons for whose benefit our "schools for the deaf" are intended—persons so deaf from birth, childhood or youth that they cannot be educated in common schools, persons who are more frequently but less accurately classed as "the deaf and dumb" or "deaf-mutes."† It includes all persons who are recorded in school reports, census reports, marriage records, etc., as "deaf and dumb," "deaf-mutes," "totally deaf," "very deaf," "deaf," or "very hard of hearing," and all who have attended schools for the deaf. Persons recorded as "slightly deaf," "partially deaf," "deaf in one ear," "deaf in adult life," "hard of hearing," etc., are not included, unless they have attended schools for the deaf.

The present Inquiry was begun in the year 1889, and the work has continued uninterruptedly since that time. In October of the previous year the Hon. Frederick Howard Wines, then Secretary of the Illinois State Board

\* H. MYGIND, "Deaf-Mutism," London, 1894, p. 63.

† Many of the persons so classed are really deaf-mutes, but others had learned to speak in childhood before hearing was lost, and still others have been taught to speak by teachers of articulation. To the two classes last named the terms "dumb" and "mute" are inappropriate.

of Charities, had addressed a circular letter to the heads of American schools for the deaf, asking their co-operation in an effort to establish a record of future marriages of the deaf in the United States, which he proposed to publish in the *International Record of Charities and Correction*, a periodical of which he was the editor. He prepared a form of record which was to show whether either of the partners in marriage was a hearing and speaking person, and, if not, whether he or she was congenitally or adventitiously deaf. As some of the replies received by Mr. Wines suggested that the *American Annals of the Deaf* would be a more suitable medium for the proposed publication, he offered to transfer the whole scheme to the editor of the *Annals*. The offer was accepted. On further consideration it was decided to modify the plan considerably, extending it so as to comprise past as well as future marriages, to include in the Inquiry many important details not provided for in the original scheme, and to defer publication until a large body of statistics should have been collected and collated. The following blank marriage record was prepared and copies were widely distributed among heads of schools for the deaf, the deaf themselves, and their relatives and friends :

[Please answer the questions as fully as possible, and return the record to E. A. FAX, *Kendall Green, Washington, D. C* ]

Marriage record of ——— (husband) and ——— (name of wife before marriage )

#### I. *Details Relating to Marriage.\**

1. Date of marriage? Place of marriage? Were the parties related before marriage? If so, what relationship? Give any other details known relating to marriage.

2. OFFSPRING. Total number of children born of this marriage? How many deaf? How many hearing? How many died in infancy? Give any other details known relating to offspring; for example—names, dates of birth or death, causes of death, ages at death, etc., where possible. If any are or were deaf, write the word *deaf* after their names.

\* In the original of the blank marriage record ample spaces are left for answers to all the questions.

*II. Questions to be Answered by Husband.*

1. **PARENTAGE.** Name of your father? Name of your mother before marriage? Were your parents related before marriage? If so, what relationship? Give any other details known relating to parents; for example—causes of death, dates of death, ages at death, etc., where possible.

2. **BROTHERS AND SISTERS.** Give your full name and date of birth, and the names of all your brothers and sisters, with dates of birth, if possible. Where dates are not given, state whether names are in the order of birth or lot. How many of these (yourself included) are or were deaf? How many hearing? How many died young (under two years)? Give any other details known; for example—causes of death, ages at death, etc. Write the word *deaf* after the names of all who are or were deaf.

3. **OTHER RELATIVES.** Have you any deaf relatives other than brothers and sisters or children? If so, give relationship and names, if possible.

4. **NOTE.** Are you deaf or hearing? If deaf: Age when deafness occurred? Cause of deafness? Attended what school or institution? Residence when admitted? Year when admitted? Age when admitted? Years under instruction? Present residence? Occupation?

*III. Questions to be Answered by Wife.*

1. **PARENTAGE.** Name of your father? Name of your mother before marriage? Were your parents related before marriage? If so, what relationship? Give any other details known relating to parents; for example—causes of death, dates of death, ages at death, etc., where possible.

2. **BROTHERS AND SISTERS.** Give your full name and date of birth, and the names of all your brothers and sisters, with dates of birth, if possible. Where dates are not given, state whether names are in order of birth or not. How many of these (yourself included) are or were deaf? How many hearing? How many died young (under two years)? Give any other details known, for example—causes of death, ages at death, etc. Write the word *deaf* after the names of all who are or were deaf.

3. **OTHER RELATIVES.** Have you any deaf relatives other than brothers and sisters or children? If so, give relationship and names, if possible.

4. **NOTE.** Are you deaf or hearing? If deaf: Age when deafness occurred? Cause of deafness? Attended what school or institution? Residence when admitted? Year when admitted? Age when admitted? Years under instruction? Present residence? Occupation?

*IV. Remarks.*

Date of information.

(Signed)

The replies received to the inquiries contained in the above blank marriage record have been far more numerous



and more complete than was anticipated. Several thousand records have been returned with the questions more or less fully answered. Many of these have been duplicates, and in some cases five or six returns have been made by different persons concerning the same marriage. As details omitted by one correspondent have often been furnished by another, all have been welcome. In cases of doubtful, uncertain, or contradictory returns, verification has been sought by further correspondence. Much additional information has been obtained from the early volumes of the *American Annals of the Deaf*, the numerous periodicals published for the benefit of the deaf, the annual and biennial reports of schools and institutions, and the returns of the United States census enumerators. The result of the whole effort is a collection of records of marriages of the deaf far larger than all previous collections put together; records, moreover, which, notwithstanding many defects, are believed to be trustworthy in their essential features, and which contain an immense quantity of valuable statistical information concerning the partners in marriage, their children, parents, brothers and sisters, and other relatives.

Without the assistance which has been rendered by many persons, the work could not have been accomplished. Acknowledgments are due to nearly all the heads of American schools for the deaf, who have supplied such statistics concerning their former pupils as were given in their school records, and have obtained others by correspondence and personal inquiry; to several teachers in schools for the deaf, who have devoted much time to the copying and comparison of records, and the collection of further data; to many of the deaf themselves, who have not only cheerfully given all desired information concerning their own marriages, but have been of great service in gathering statistics concerning the marriages of others; and to several students of Gallaudet College, who have rendered

important help in copying records and collating results, above all Miss May Martin, who has been my faithful and efficient assistant for the past three years. Special acknowledgment is due to Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, who, as soon as he learned of the work in which I was engaged, committed to my hands all the material relating to the marriages of the deaf which he himself had collected, and placed at my disposal the resources of the "Volta Fund," a sum which he had set apart a short time before for the increase and diffusion of knowledge relating to the deaf. The Volta Bureau, afterwards established for the administration of this fund, has continued to furnish the necessary means for the prosecution of the inquiry. To prevent all possible misunderstanding, I may be permitted to add that, while I have drawn freely upon the Volta Fund to compensate my numerous helpers, my own share in the work, which has occupied the greater part of my leisure hours for the past six years, has been purely a labor of love.

The work was undertaken, and has been carried on, in the hope that it might be of service to the deaf and to society by settling definitely the question whether or not the deaf are more liable than hearing persons to have deaf children; and, if it should appear that, notwithstanding the numerous instances to the contrary, they are more liable to this result, by ascertaining whether or not the liability is increased by the marriage of the deaf with one another; also whether certain classes of the deaf, however married, are more liable than others to have deaf children; and, if this should prove to be the case, by determining how these classes are respectively composed, so that, as the result of the conclusions reached, in many instances deaf persons might be advised to follow the choice of their own hearts in marriage, with no restrictions whatever except such as should influence all right-minded persons in this important matter; while, in cases where the deafness of

the parent was unquestionably more liable than in others to reappear in the offspring, the persons interested might be effectively warned in time of the danger incurred. If such results shall follow this work, I shall feel amply repaid for all the time and labor it has cost.

EDWARD ALLEN FAY.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE,  
KENDALL GREEN,  
WASHINGTON, D. C , *December*, 1895.

# AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE RESULTS OF MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF IN AMERICA.

## CHAPTER I.

### MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF, ONE OR BOTH OF THE PARTNERS BEING DEAF.

THE total number of marriages of the deaf in the United States and Canada, one or both of the partners being deaf, concerning which trustworthy returns, more or less complete, have been received, is 4,471. Active efforts to obtain reports of recent marriages ceased after June, 1894, but 33 records of marriages occurring since that date have been received and are included in the tabulation. It is not supposed that all the marriages of the deaf that have taken place in the United States and Canada up to the end of June, 1894, are included in this collection, but it is believed that a majority of them are included.

The following table shows the number of marriages recorded as having taken place in each decade of the nineteenth century down to the present, the number in the first 3½ years of the present decade, the number occurring since June, 1894, that are included in the tabulation, and the number of which the dates are unreported, together with the percentage of the number of marriages of each period to the whole number of marriages :

TABLE I.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number.	Percentage.
In first decade, 1801-1810*.....	1	.022
In second decade, 1811-1820†....	1	.022
In third decade, 1821-1830. ....	8	.179
In fourth decade, 1831-1840 . ....	37	.827
In fifth decade, 1841-1850 . . . .	84	1.879
In sixth decade, 1851-1860 . . . .	198	4.429
In seventh decade, 1861-1870 . . .	369	8.253
In eighth decade, 1871-1880.....	532	11.899
In ninth decade, 1881-1890. ....	1,017	22.747
In 3½ years of tenth decade, 1891-June 30, 1894	534	11.944
Since June 30, 1894 .. . . .	33	.738
Dates not reported . . . . .	1,657	37.061
Total. ....	4,471	100.000

Probably the actual rate of progression in the number of marriages from decade to decade is not precisely as indicated by the above table, since (1) the marriages of the earlier decades are probably less fully recorded than the later ones, and (2) a considerable number of the marriages

\*The first marriage of which the date is recorded took place in 1803. The husband was an uneducated deaf-mute, the wife a hearing woman. After the first American school for the deaf was opened at Hartford, fourteen years later, the husband sought admission as a pupil, but was thrice refused on account of his age. He was finally admitted, at the age of fifty, on condition that he himself would pay the tuition fees. He remained a year, making excellent progress.

†In the second marriage recorded (1819) both partners were deaf. Thirty-nine years later, in an address delivered before the instructors and pupils of the Hartford School, the husband said that, when he married, "the marriage of deaf-mutes with each other was objected to by many friends, and even by Dr. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, then principal of the Hartford School. It was feared they would suffer too many inconveniences, also that the number of deaf-mutes would thereby be multiplied. He related how the first thing he did, on the birth of his first child, was to satisfy himself, by experiment, that the child could hear, and how pleased he was to find that the discouraging predictions of his friends had failed to come to pass." (*American Annals of the Deaf*, Hartford, 1858, vol. x, page 181.) Similar experiments, after the birth of a child, to ascertain whether it could hear or not, have been made by many an anxious deaf parent since.

of which the dates are not reported belong to the earlier decades. The high rate of progression beginning with the third decade and continuing with some variations down to the present time is doubtless largely due to the establishment of schools for the deaf in America, the first of which was opened at Hartford in 1817, and which now number 89 in the United States and 6 in Canada. The educated deaf are brought into closer relations with the world of hearing people and with one another than the uneducated, and are better able to marry and support a family.

The number of partners in marriage tallying with the number of marriages, if each person had been married but once, would be 8,942; but 362 of the deaf partners were married twice, 2 of the hearing partners were married twice to deaf persons, 32 of the deaf were married thrice, 2 were married four times, and one was married five times. Making the necessary deductions for these second, third, fourth, and fifth marriages, the number of partners in marriage comprised in the records is 8,504. They are classified, with respect to deafness or hearing, as follows:

TABLE II.

Partners in marriage.	Number.	Percentage.
Deaf persons..... ..	7, 277	85.571
Hearing persons. ....	892	10.489
Persons unreported whether deaf or hearing	335	3.940
Total..... ..	8, 504	100.000

Of the 4,471 marriages comprised in these records, there are 974 with respect to which I have no information concerning the offspring resulting therefrom. These are mostly marriages of which the records have been made from announcements published in the early volumes of the *American Annals of the Deaf*, or in other periodi-

cals relating to the deaf, with the addition of such details as could be derived from institution records, but with respect to which it was impossible to obtain any information as to the later history of the persons concerned, since they had either died or changed their residences, and could not be found at the time when inquiry was made. These 974 marriages are excluded from the tabulation that follows.

The number of marriages of which the results with respect to offspring have been reported, one or both of the partners in marriage being deaf, is 3,497. Of these marriages 419 were very recent, having taken place less than a year before they were recorded, and, consequently, offspring was not to be expected from them. These 419 marriages are excluded from the tabulation that follows, leaving 3,078 marriages of a year's standing or longer, concerning the results of which inquiry is to be made.

The total number of children reported as born of these 3,078 marriages is 6,782. The actual number of children, as will be explained later (page 19), is probably somewhat larger than this. As many of the married couples are still living, the future results may be different from those here reported.

Before entering upon the questions proposed at the outset of this Inquiry, let us briefly consider one not there specified, which, though of less interest, is not without importance from a sociological and physiological point of view, viz: Are marriages of the deaf less productive of offspring than ordinary marriages? According to the statistics of marriages of former pupils of the Hartford School, published by Dr. Williams, Principal of that School, a few years ago, they are much less productive. Of the 590 marriages he reported, 283, or 47.9 per cent., were without offspring. Dr. Williams says on this point: "It will be noticed that nearly one-half of the marriages are without issue, so far as we have been able to learn.

It is probable that in some cases there have been children of whom we have received no account. In other cases the marriages are of recent date. But, making due allowance for all these, the proportion of sterile marriages is still very large, much exceeding that in the general population. It is a serious question whether nature alone is responsible for this barrenness.”\*

The proportion of sterile marriages contained in the present collection is not nearly as large as in the statistics reported by Dr. Williams. Of the 3,078 marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, 434, or 14.1 per cent., were without offspring. This is not a large proportion; probably it is not much larger than that of ordinary marriages. We have no statistics of sterility in marriage for the whole country with which to compare this result, but the proportion of married women living in Massachusetts in 1885 who were without children was 17.56 per cent.†

The number of marriages reported in these records which are known to have resulted in children is 2,644. The number of children reported is 6,782. Probably the actual number of children, as will be explained later (page 19), is larger; but the number reported gives an average of 2.565 children to each marriage. We have no statistics showing the average number of children to a marriage for the whole country; but in Massachusetts in 1885 the average number of children to each mother who had had children was 4.11.‡ The mothers of the 6,782 children reported in these marriage records of the deaf number 2,598, giving an average of 2.61 children to each mother. When we consider that the children are

---

\* JOB WILLIAMS, "Hereditary Deafness.—A Study," in "Science," New York, 1891, vol. xvii, No. 418, p. 77.

† The Census of Massachusetts, 1885. "Population and Social Statistics," vol. i, Part 2, p. 1171.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 1169.



probably not fully reported, and that a considerable proportion of the marriages, as shown by Table I, are of comparatively recent date, it seems probable that marriages of the deaf are somewhat, but not very much, less productive than ordinary marriages. That they are somewhat less productive may perhaps be due, as suggested by Dr. Mygind, not directly to the deafness of one or both of the partners in marriage, but to the circumstance that the age of the deaf at the time of marriage, owing to the later age at which they leave school, is higher than that of the general population.\*

We will now consider the first question proposed in this Inquiry, viz: Are marriages of deaf persons more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages?

There are two ways in which the results of the marriages of the deaf, with respect to deaf offspring, may properly be considered. First, we may regard the marriages, and ascertain what number and percentage of them resulted in deaf offspring. Secondly, we may regard the children born from these marriages, and ascertain what number and percentage of them were deaf. I shall pursue each of these methods in turn:

First, regarding the marriages, the following table shows all the marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, one or both of the partners being deaf, and the number and proportion of them that resulted in deaf offspring (with or without other offspring):

TABLE III.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percentage.
One or both partners deaf.....	3,078	300	9.746

\* H. MYGIND, "Deaf-Mutes in Denmark," in "Archives of Otology," New York, 1892, vol. xxi, p. 416.

We do not know just what proportion of marriages in which both of the partners are hearing persons result in deaf offspring; but the proportion is certainly very much less than 9.746 per cent. Probably it is much less than one per cent.

Even if we should include in the tabulation the 974 marriages of which the results were not reported and the 419 marriages which took place less than a year before they were recorded, and should assume that none of them resulted in deaf offspring, making the number of marriages upon which the calculation was based 4,471, the marriages resulting in deaf offspring would be 6.7 per cent. of all the marriages, which is certainly a very much larger proportion than that of marriages in which both of the partners are hearing persons.

Now let us regard the children born from these marriages and ascertain what number and percentage of them were deaf. This is shown in the following table:

TABLE IV.

Children born from marriages of the deaf.	Number.	Percentage.
Deaf children .....	588	8.670
Hearing children.....	5,091	75.066
Children unreported whether deaf or hearing	1,103	16.264
Total.....	6,782	100.000

The actual number and percentage of "hearing children" are probably greater than shown in the above table. In some cases the sources from which the information was derived merely reported "several children, all hearing," "several hearing children," or other words to the same effect. In order to be on the safe side, I have allowed only two hearing children to each marriage in which "several" were reported, though the actual numbers may have been and probably were greater. In general, moreover, the hear-

ing children are less fully reported than the deaf children, since in many cases I have been able to obtain information of the latter through school records, census returns, newspaper items, etc., but not of the former. Where the total number of children is not explicitly stated in the records, I have assumed that the total number was the sum of those whose names were recorded, though there may have been, and in some cases there probably were, other children whose names were not recorded.

Of the 1,103 "children unreported whether deaf or hearing," 813 are children the fact of whose existence was ascertained from announcements of births in early volumes of the *American Annals of the Deaf*, or in other periodicals relating to the deaf, from school records and other sources, concerning whom it was impossible, at the time of this Inquiry, to obtain further information. It is probable that these were mostly hearing children, for if they had been deaf, when they arrived at a suitable age they would probably have been sent to some school for the deaf, and would have been reported as the children of deaf parents in the "School Statistics of the Deaf,"\* from which all the information bearing upon the marriages of the deaf has been carefully gleaned for the purposes of this Inquiry. The remaining 290 "children unreported whether deaf or hearing" are children who were stillborn, or who died in

\* The "School Statistics of the Deaf," are comprised in a nearly complete card catalogue of all the deaf who attended schools for the deaf in the United States up to the year 1890, the only exceptions being in the case of a few Southern schools whose records were destroyed during the Civil War. This catalogue was made in connection with the work of the Eleventh Census of the United States, and is now deposited in the Volta Bureau. The number of pupils recorded is 27,924, and concerning each pupil are given all the important details of his or her antecedents, school life, and after life that are contained in the records of the school attended. A fuller description of this work and a summary of a part of the contents are given in the "Proceedings of the World's Congress of Instructors of the Deaf," Washington, 1893, pp. 269-283.

infancy before it was ascertained whether they were deaf or hearing.

We do not know what proportion of the children are deaf among children born from marriages in which both of the partners are hearing persons, but it is certainly very much less than 8.67 per cent. It is probably less than one-tenth of one per cent.

The first question of our Inquiry, then, must be answered in the affirmative. Marriages of deaf persons, one or both of the partners in marriage being deaf (taken as a whole, without regard to the character of the deafness), are far more liable to result in deaf offspring than marriages in which both of the partners are hearing persons.\*

On the other hand, these records show that marriages of deaf persons, one or both of the partners being deaf (taken as a whole, without regard to the character of the deafness), are far more likely to result in hearing offspring than in deaf offspring. At least 75 per cent. of the children reported could hear, and since, (1) as above explained (page 19), the hearing children are probably less fully reported than the deaf children, and (2) a large majority of the 16 per cent. "unreported whether deaf or hearing" could probably hear, the proportion of hearing children is doubtless considerably higher than 75 per cent.

The above conclusions, it may be remarked in passing, seem to be in accordance with the generally accepted laws of heredity. It is one of these laws that a physical anomaly,

---

\* Of course I am aware of the fact that many marriages in which both of the partners are hearing persons result in deaf offspring. Sometimes such a marriage results in several deaf children. Indeed, it would be easy to collect statistics showing a much larger proportion of deaf children resulting from marriages in which both of the partners were hearing persons than from these marriages of the deaf. But such marriages would be selected cases, and would therefore not afford a suitable basis of comparison. The marriages of the deaf here recorded are all of which trustworthy information could be obtained, and their results must be compared, not with those of selected cases, but with the average results of marriages of hearing persons. .

or an unusual liability to certain diseases, existing in the parent tends to be transmitted to the offspring. Deafness, it is true, is neither a physical anomaly nor a disease, and such expressions as "transmitted deafness," "inherited deafness," etc., are inaccurate and misleading. When the deafness of the parent reappears in the offspring, what is really transmitted and inherited is not deafness, but some anomaly of the auditory organs or of the nervous system, or the tendency to some disease, of which deafness is but the result or the symptom.\* It would be strange, indeed, if the anomaly of the auditory organs or of the nervous system, or the disease, that caused the deafness of the parent were never transmitted to the offspring.

On the other hand, the fact that a large majority of the children born from deaf parents can hear seems to accord with the law of heredity that the offspring tend to revert to the normal type.

---

\* This distinction is not a mere purism, but, as will appear later, has an important bearing upon some of the questions proposed in the present Inquiry.

## CHAPTER II.

### MARRIAGES IN WHICH BOTH OF THE PARTNERS ARE DEAF, AND MARRIAGES IN WHICH ONE OF THE PARTNERS IS A HEARING PERSON.

In this chapter the results of marriages in which both of the partners were deaf\* are to be compared with the results of marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other was a hearing person.

Most of the statistics that have hitherto been published have indicated a tendency on the part of deaf people to marry one another rather than hearing persons. This tendency appears markedly in the marriages reported in the present collection of records, as is shown by the following table, which gives the number and percentage of the marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, and the number and percentage of those in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person :

---

\* The term generally employed in discussions of this subject to denote marriages in which both of the partners are deaf is "intermarriage." This is objectionable, first, because the word, as most frequently used in general literature, has a meaning directly contrary to the one intended in these discussions. In general literature "intermarriage" usually means marriage between persons of different classes, as "intermarriage of nobles and plebeians," "intermarriage of blacks and whites," "intermarriage of deaf persons and hearing persons." It is also objectionable because it gives to the prefix *inter* a meaning contrary to that which it has in other compound words much used in treating of heredity, viz., "interbreeding," which signifies breeding by crossing different stocks, and "intercrossing," which signifies the process or result of cross fertilization between different kinds or varieties. There seems to be no unambiguous word in the English language to denote marriage between persons of the same class.

TABLE V.

Marriages of the Deaf	Num- ber.	Per- centage.
Both partners deaf. . . . .	3,242	72.512
One partner deaf, the other hearing ...	894	19.995
One partner deaf; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.....	335	7.493
Total..	4,471	100.000

Probably the actual percentage of the marriages in which one of the partners is a hearing person is somewhat larger than appears from the above table; for marriages of this class are probably less fully reported in these records than those in which both of the partners were deaf. But, making due allowance for this circumstance, there is no doubt that marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are far more numerous than those in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person.

Before proceeding to the examination of results, let us inquire briefly into the reason why so large a proportion of the deaf marry one another. Dr. Bell says that "the immediate cause is undoubtedly the preference that adult deaf-mutes exhibit for the companionship of deaf-mutes rather than that of hearing persons." This preference he ascribes to the following supposed causes: (1) the segregation of the deaf for the purposes of education; (2) the reunions of former pupils at the schools where they were educated, the meetings of the adult deaf for religious worship and social intercourse, and societies and conventions of the deaf in general; (3) newspapers published for the reading of the deaf; (4) the use of the sign-language; (5) the attempt to reduce the sign-language to writing; (6) incorrect ideas concerning the deaf prevalent in the community, and (7) the employment of deaf teachers. The chief causes, to which "nearly all the other causes

are ultimately referable," he regards as "(1) segregation for the purposes of education, and (2) the use, as a means of communication, of a language which is different from that of the people." As "preventive measures" he recommends a hearing environment during the period of education, oral instruction, and the suppression of the sign-language.\*

Until the year 1869 all the schools for the deaf in the United States and Canada were boarding or "segregate" schools, and the majority of them, including nearly all the larger schools, still belong to this class. In most of them at present more or less oral instruction is given, but the sign-language has been, and is still, used to a considerable extent as a means of communication, and many deaf teachers are employed. Reunions of former pupils are held from time to time in these schools; there are associations of the adult deaf for religious worship, literary improvement, and social intercourse in nearly all the large cities; State and National conventions of the deaf are not infrequent. More than forty newspapers intended especially for the reading of the deaf are published, chiefly at the schools for the deaf. The great majority of the married deaf in America, therefore, have been educated under the environment to which Dr. Bell ascribes their preference for companionship with one another.

On the other hand, within the past twenty-seven years, there have been established in the United States a considerable number of day schools, whose pupils reside at their own homes and are brought together only during school-hours. Most of these day schools are exclusively oral† schools, in which signs are used as little as possible. In the "segregate" exclusively oral schools also, the first

---

\* A. G. BELL, "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," Reprint, Washington, 1884, pp. 41-48.

† I use the term "exclusively oral," because oral instruction is now given to many of the pupils in nearly all the schools of America.



of which in America were established nearly thirty years ago, signs are used as little as possible, reunions of former pupils are not held, associations and conventions of the deaf are discouraged, newspapers or other periodicals intended especially for the reading of the deaf are not published, and the pupils are urged after leaving school to shun the society of the deaf and to associate only with hearing people. In these day and oral schools, therefore, the influences which Dr. Bell deprecates as the cause of the marriages of the deaf with one another are either wholly absent or are reduced to a minimum. Though their graduates are still few as compared with those of the older schools, they are numerous enough, and a sufficient number of them have married, to enable us to test the correctness of Dr. Bell's explanation of the marriages of the deaf with one another.

The following table shows the number of deaf married persons, and the number and percentage of them married to deaf partners, classified according to the kind of school they attended, viz: persons who attended boarding or "segregate" schools, persons who attended day schools, persons who attended both boarding and day schools, and persons who attended no school for the deaf. Of the last named some had private instruction at home, some attended common schools for hearing persons before they became deaf, and others were without education:

TABLE VI

Deaf married persons	Number of deaf married persons	MARRIED TO DEAF PARTNERS.	
		Number	Percentage.
Attended boarding schools for the deaf	6,494	5,598	86.208
Attended day-schools for the deaf	45	35	77.778
Attended both boarding and day schools for the deaf	27	21	77.778
Attended no school for the deaf	125	78	62.400
School attended, or kind of school attended, not known	586	453	77.304
Total	7,277	6,185	84.994

The following table shows the number of deaf married persons, and the number and percentage of them married to deaf partners, classified according to the methods of instruction pursued in the schools they attended, viz: persons who attended schools not exclusively oral, persons who attended exclusively oral schools, persons who attended schools of both kinds, and persons who attended no school for the deaf:

TABLE VII.

Deaf married persons.	Number of deaf married persons	MARRIED TO DEAF PARTNERS.	
		Number	Percentage.
Attended schools not exclusively oral	6,415	5,535	86 282
Attended exclusively oral schools	147	115	78 231
Attended both exclusively oral schools and schools not exclusively oral	45	39	86 666
Attended no school for the deaf	125	78	62 400
School attended, or methods of school attended, not known . . . . .	545	418	76 697
Total	7,277	6,185	84 994

It appears from Tables VI and VII that the percentage of deaf persons marrying deaf partners was larger among those who attended boarding or "segregate" schools and schools not exclusively oral than among those who attended day and oral schools and those who attended no school for the deaf. It follows that the influences named by Dr. Bell do tend to promote and increase marriages of the deaf with one another, and that by the "preventive measures" he recommends the number of such marriages can be somewhat diminished.

But are the influences named the sole, or even the principal, cause of the preference of the deaf for marriage with one another? If so, how are we to account for the fact, shown by Tables VI and VII, that a very large majority of the former pupils of day and oral schools, and even a large majority of the deaf who attended no school for the deaf, married deaf partners?

It may be said that the societies and associations origi-

nally composed of former pupils of the older schools, to the influences of which the graduates of day and oral schools, and deaf persons who have attended no school for the deaf, are more or less subject, are responsible for the marriages of the latter with deaf partners. Doubtless they are to some extent; but this cause alone does not seem adequate to explain the large percentage of such marriages. If it be insisted that it is, the question still remains, Why are the graduates of day and oral schools, and deaf persons who have attended no school for the deaf, with whom the "preventive measures" recommended have been faithfully and earnestly applied, so readily attracted to these societies, and why are the societies able to exert so powerful an influence upon them?

The truth is that there is another cause, less tangible perhaps than those above mentioned, but more profound, which explains not only the marriages with one another of the deaf who have been taught in "segregate" schools and with the assistance of the sign-language, but of all the deaf, under whatever circumstances and by whatever method of instruction they have been educated. This profounder cause is the deep feeling of fellowship, affinity, kinship, sympathy, which has its roots in the similarity of condition of all the deaf, and which affects those who have been educated in day and oral schools, and even those who have attended no school for the deaf, in only a little less degree than those who have been segregated for the purposes of education and have attended schools where the sign-language is used to a considerable extent as a means of communication. In no human relation is the truth of the proverbs, "Birds of a feather flock together," and "A fellow-feeling makes one wondrous kind," more fully exemplified than in the friendships and marriages of the deaf. The law of natural selection which attracts deaf people to one another may be hindered somewhat in its operation by placing them in an environment of hearing

persons, giving them oral instruction, and repressing the use of the sign-language, but it cannot be abolished, and only in exceptional cases can it be nullified. *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.* When opportunity occurs the strong attraction of mutual sympathy draws the deaf together; community of feeling breaks down the barriers that parents and teachers have taken so much pains to erect, sympathy grows into love, and love results in marriage.

But it is less important for us to determine the reason why a majority of the deaf marry one another than to ascertain the results of such marriages.

Following the same order of inquiry as in the last chapter, let us first see whether marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are less productive of offspring than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person.

The following table includes all the marriages of the deaf of which the results have been reported, except 419 marriages that took place less than a year before they were recorded, from which, consequently, offspring was not to be expected. It shows the number of marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, the number in which one of them was deaf and the other a hearing person, and the number and percentage of each class that were without offspring:

TABLE VIII.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES WITHOUT OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent's.
Both partners deaf .....	2,377	359	15.108
One partner deaf, the other hearing..	599	68	11.352
One partner deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	102	7	6.862
Total .....	3,078	434	14.100

It appears from Table VIII that a larger percentage of marriages in which both of the partners were deaf was without offspring than of marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person.

The following table shows the number of marriages of each class that resulted in offspring, the number of children born from the marriages of each class, and the average number of children to a marriage in each class :

TABLE IX.

Marriages of the deaf resulting in offspring	Number of marriages		Average number to each marriage
Both partners deaf . . . . .	2,018	5,072	2 513
One partner deaf; the other hearing .	531	1,532	2.885
One partner deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing . . . . .	95	178	1.874
Total . . . . .	2,644	6,782	2.565

It appears from Table IX that the average number of children to each marriage was slightly less in marriages where both of the partners were deaf than in marriages where one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person. As the children of marriages of the latter class are probably less fully reported in the marriage records than those of the former, the actual difference in the percentages was probably a little greater than appears from the table.

We saw in the last chapter (p. 16-18) that marriages of the deaf, taken as a whole, are probably somewhat less productive than ordinary marriages. We must now conclude that marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are somewhat less productive than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person.

We come now to the most important question to be considered in this chapter, the second question proposed at the outset of our Inquiry: Are marriages in which both of the partners are deaf more liable to result in deaf offspring than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person?

In seeking an answer to this question I shall pursue the same method as in Chapter I, regarding first the 3,078 marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, and ascertaining what number and percentage of each class of marriage resulted in deaf offspring; and, secondly, regarding the 6,782 children born from these marriages, and ascertaining what number and proportion of the children born from each class of marriage were deaf.

First, regarding the marriages, and classifying them with respect to the deafness of one or of both of the partners in marriage, the following table shows the number of marriages of each class of which the results have been reported, and the number and percentage of them resulting in deaf offspring (with or without other offspring):

TABLE X

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percentage.
Both partners deaf. . . . .	2,377	220	9.255
One partner deaf; the other hearing.	599	75	12.522
One partner deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing. ....	102	5	4.902
Total.....	3,078	300	9.746

Regarding next the children born from these marriages, the following table shows the number born from marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, the number born

from marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person, and the number and percentage of deaf children born from the marriages of each class :

TABLE XI.

Marriages of the deaf	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Per- centage.
Both partners deaf . . . . .	5,072	429	8.458
One partner deaf, the other hearing	1,532	151	9.856
One partner deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing. .	178	8	4.494
Total . . . . .	6,782	588	8.670

It appears from Table X that a smaller percentage of marriages in which both of the partners were deaf resulted in deaf offspring than of marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person ; and it appears from Table XI that a smaller percentage of deaf children was born from marriages in which both of the partners were deaf than from marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person.

The second question proposed at the outset of this Inquiry, therefore, must be answered in the negative. Taking the deaf as a whole, without regard to the character of the deafness, marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are not more liable to result in deaf offspring than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person.

The statistics of Tables X and XI are remarkable. Aside from the question of the possible intensification of the tendency to deafness in the offspring resulting from the union of "like with like," which will be considered in a future chapter, it might be expected that with both partners deaf the liability to deafness in the offspring would be twice as great as with only one partner deaf, for in each

marriage there would be two persons to transmit the physical conditions liable to result in deafness, instead of only one person ; but not only does it appear from these tables that a smaller percentage of marriages resulted in deaf offspring and a smaller percentage of deaf children was born where both of the partners were deaf than where one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person, but it also appears that the proportion of deaf children born to the number of deaf persons married was far less where both of the partners were deaf than where one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person. This is still more apparent from the following table, which shows the number of deaf persons married for a year or longer to deaf and hearing partners respectively, of whose marriages the results are reported, the number of deaf children born from these marriages, and the number born to every 100 deaf married persons in each class :

TABLE XII.

Deaf married persons.	Number of deaf married persons	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number	Number born to every 100 deaf married persons
Deaf persons married to deaf partners.....	4,568	429	9.391
Deaf persons married to hearing partners .....	585	151	25.812
Deaf persons married to partners unreported whether deaf or hearing.	100	8	8.000
Total * .....	5,199	588	11.310

If the 4,568 deaf persons who married deaf partners had married hearing partners instead, and if the proportion of

\* Fifty deaf persons were married both to deaf and hearing partners, two both to deaf partners and partners unreported whether deaf or hearing, and two both to hearing partners and partners unreported whether deaf or hearing.



deaf children born of such marriages had been as large as it was in the case of the 585 deaf persons who did marry hearing partners, as shown in the above table, the number of deaf children born would have been 1,179 instead of 429. It appears therefore that, with respect to the number of deaf children liable to be born into the world, it is far less dangerous for the deaf to marry one another than it is for them to marry hearing persons.

Similar results—but less striking, because derived from a smaller number of cases—have appeared in some, not all, of the previously published statistics of marriages of the deaf, and two or three different explanations of them have been proposed. Mr. Sedgwick, an English writer who has given considerable study to the subject of heredity, suggests, in explanation of the small percentage of deaf children born from marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, that it may be owing to “excess having reversed the action of some natural law in development.”\* Dr. Bell, in explanation of the large percentage of deaf children born from marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person, suggests that in a majority of such marriages the deaf partner was probably congenitally deaf, and the hearing partner as well as the deaf partner probably belonged to a family containing deaf persons.† Dr. Love, of Glasgow, the most recent and one of the acutest and most discriminating of the writers who have inquired into this subject, regards the statistics showing a larger percentage of deaf children from marriages in which only one of the partners was deaf as exceptional, but adds that “when it does happen it is probably because the parents do not represent correctly

---

\* W. SEDGWICK, “On Sexual Limitation in Hereditary Disease,” in “British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review,” London, 1861, vol. xxviii, p. 204.

† A. G. BELL, “Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race,” Reprint, Washington, 1884, pp. 24-26.

the *tendency* to deafness in their respective families. For example, two hearing members representing families in which the tendency to hereditary deafness is strong will, if they marry, have a larger percentage of deaf progeny than two deaf persons representing families in which the tendency is less strongly marked. It is the family history extending through many generations, not the personal history of the parents, which must guide us when we estimate the chances of the occurrence of deafness in the offspring."\*

We shall be better prepared to estimate the value of these explanations, and of any others that may be offered, after we have examined the classification of the deaf with respect to the nature and circumstances of the deafness. Their consideration is therefore deferred to a future chapter. "In the present state of our knowledge," as Darwin says in commenting upon Mr. Sedgwick's suggestion above quoted, "In the present state of our knowledge it is safer to look at the whole case as simply unintelligible."†

---

\* J. K. LOVE, "Deaf Mutism, a Clinical and Pathological Study," Glasgow, 1896, p. 87.

† C. R. DARWIN, "The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication," New York, 1868, vol. II, p. 34.

## CHAPTER III.

### MARRIAGES OF THE CONGENITALLY DEAF AND OF THE ADVENTITIOUSLY DEAF.

THE third question proposed at the outset of this Inquiry was: Are certain classes of the deaf, however they may marry, more liable than others to have deaf children, and, if so, how are these classes respectively composed, and what are the conditions that increase or diminish this liability? In the present chapter the classes considered will be the congenitally deaf and the adventitiously deaf.

In the earliest discussions concerning marriages of the deaf the opinion was expressed that persons born deaf were more liable to have deaf offspring than those who became deaf at some period after birth from adventitious causes, and most of the statistics hitherto published have tended to confirm this opinion. In the present Inquiry, therefore, pains have been taken to ascertain as fully as possible whether the deaf partners in marriage were congenitally or adventitiously deaf.

In estimating the value of all statistics on this subject it should be remembered that in many cases the fact of congenital or adventitious deafness cannot be determined with certainty. Indeed, the fact of congenital deafness cannot be determined with absolute certainty in any case. At the moment of birth it is impossible to find out whether the power of hearing exists or not, though a few days later, probably, this can be ascertained by applying proper tests.\* Generally, the fact of deafness is not discovered until the child arrives at the age when children usually begin to

---

\* See "Tests of Hearing in Infants," in "American Annals of the Deaf," Washington, 1890, vol. xxxv, p. 234.

talk ; at that time it is impossible to say whether the deafness has existed from birth or has occurred at some subsequent period. If the child has suffered from some unmistakable disease that is known to be a frequent cause of deafness, the case is likely to be recorded as adventitious ; it may possibly, however, have been congenital. If, on the other hand, no such disease has been observed, the case is likely to be recorded as congenital ; but it is, perhaps, quite as likely that the hearing has been lost in consequence of some unnoticed inflammation of the mucous membrane of the tympanic cavity or of the air-passages occurring soon after birth, or at some subsequent time before the deafness was discovered.\* Deafness truly congenital is probably of much rarer occurrence than is indicated by even the most trustworthy statistics, and the only adventitious cases of which we can be sure are those of persons of whom it is known that they have heard at some period of their lives. It is to be understood, therefore, that "congenitally deaf," as a rule, really means "supposed to be congenitally deaf," and that "adventitiously deaf," in some cases, means "supposed to be adventitiously deaf."

The 7,277 deaf persons whose marriage records are comprised in the present collection are classified as follows with respect to the congenital or adventitious character of their deafness :

---

\* A. DE CANDOLLE, "Sur la Production par Sélection aux États-Unis d'une Race de Sourds-Muets," Geneva, 1886. L. TURNBULL, "Progress of Otology," in "Medical and Surgical Reporter," January 23, 1886.

TABLE XIII.

Deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Congenitally deaf . . . . .	2, 245	30.851
Adventitiously deaf.....	3, 953	54.322
Deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.....	1, 079	14.827
Total.....	7, 277	100.000

Regarding only the persons concerning whom the fact of congenital or adventitious deafness is reported, Table XIII gives :

TABLE XIV

Deaf married persons	Number.	Percentage.
Congenitally deaf.	2, 245	36.221
Adventitiously deaf	3, 953	63.779
Total.....	6,198	100.000

Of 23,931 persons who attended American schools for the deaf up to the year 1890, 9,842, or 41 per cent., were reported as congenitally deaf, and 14,089, or 59 per cent., were reported as adventitiously deaf.\* Comparing the percentages of Table XIV with these, it appears that the proportion of the congenitally deaf who married is smaller than that of the congenitally deaf who attended school, and that the proportion of the adventitiously deaf who married is larger than that of the adventitiously deaf who attended school. This difference is perhaps to be explained, in part at least, by the superior average education of the adventitiously deaf, the comparative facility with which they communicate with the hearing world, and

\* See "School Statistics of the Deaf," in "Proceedings of the World's Congress of Instructors of the Deaf," Washington, 1893, p. 272.

their consequent more prosperous circumstances and greater ability to support a family.

The following table shows the number and percentage of the congenitally deaf classified with respect to their marriage to congenitally deaf partners, to adventitiously deaf partners, and to hearing partners, respectively :

TABLE XV

Congenitally deaf married persons	Number	Percentage.
Persons congenitally deaf married partners congenitally deaf .....	746	33.229
Persons congenitally deaf married partners adventitiously deaf .....	1,029	45.835
Persons congenitally deaf married partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported .....	219	9.755
Persons congenitally deaf married hearing partners .....	261	11.626
Persons congenitally deaf married partners unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	88	3.919
Total* .....	2,245	104.364

The following table shows the number and percentage of the adventitiously deaf classified with respect to their

\* Thirty-five congenitally deaf persons were married both to congenitally deaf and to adventitiously deaf partners, 12 were married both to congenitally deaf partners and to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, 1 was married to a congenitally deaf partner, twice to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and twice to hearing partners, 12 were married both to adventitiously deaf partners and to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, 9 were married both to congenitally deaf and to hearing partners; 14 were married both to adventitiously deaf and to hearing partners; 7 were married both to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and to hearing partners; 1 was married both to a hearing partner and to a partner unreported whether deaf or hearing; 3 were married both to congenitally deaf partners and to partners unreported whether deaf or hearing; 1 was married both to an adventitiously deaf partner and to a partner unreported whether deaf or hearing; 1 was married to a congenitally deaf partner, to an adventitiously deaf partner, and to a hearing partner.

marriage to congenitally deaf partners, to adventitiously deaf partners, and to hearing partners, respectively :

TABLE XVI.

Adventitiously deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Persons adventitiously deaf married partners congenitally deaf.....	1,023	25.879
Persons adventitiously deaf married partners adventitiously deaf.....	2,125	53.757
Persons adventitiously deaf married partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.....	345	8.727
Persons adventitiously deaf married hearing partners.....	456	11.535
Persons adventitiously deaf married partners unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	152	3.845
Total*.....	3,953	103 743

From a comparison of the several classes of persons shown in Tables XV and XVI, it appears that a plurality of the congenitally deaf and a majority of the adventitiously deaf married adventitiously deaf partners, and that the

\* Sixty adventitiously deaf persons were married both to congenitally deaf and to adventitiously deaf partners, 26 were married both to adventitiously deaf partners and to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported; 26 were married both to adventitiously deaf and to hearing partners, 1 was married to an adventitiously deaf partner, to a hearing partner, and to a partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, 6 were married both to adventitiously deaf partners and to partners unreported whether deaf or hearing; 8 were married both to congenitally deaf partners and to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, 1 was married to a congenitally deaf partner, to a partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and to a partner unreported whether deaf or hearing; 10 were married both to congenitally deaf partners and to hearing partners; 3 were married both to congenitally deaf partners and to partners unreported whether deaf or hearing; 3 were married both to hearing partners and to partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported; 1 was married both to a partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and to a partner unreported whether deaf or hearing; 1 was married both to a partner unreported whether deaf or hearing and to a hearing partner.

proportion of each class that married hearing partners was nearly equal.

Regarding only the marriages in which both of the partners were deaf and concerning which the fact of congenital or adventitious deafness is reported, Tables XV and XVI give the two tables following :

TABLE XVII.

Congenitally deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Persons congenitally deaf married partners congenitally deaf.....	746	42.898
Persons congenitally deaf married partners adventitiously deaf.....	1,029	59.172
Total*.....	1,739	102.070

TABLE XVIII.

Adventitiously deaf married persons	Number.	Percentage.
Persons adventitiously deaf married partners congenitally deaf .....	1,023	33.128
Persons adventitiously deaf married partners adventitiously deaf .....	2,125	68.811
Total† .....	3,088	101.939

It is interesting to compare the percentages of Tables XVII and XVIII with the conclusions reached a few years ago from an attempt to determine the relative proportions of the same classes of persons by "the theory of probabilities." When Dr. Bell was preparing his "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," he desired to ascertain what proportion of the congenitally deaf married congenitally deaf partners, but

\*Thirty-six congenitally deaf persons were married both to congenitally deaf and to adventitiously deaf partners.

†Sixty adventitiously deaf persons were married both to congenitally deaf and to adventitiously deaf partners.



could obtain no satisfactory statistics on that point. It occurred to him that some light might be thrown upon the subject by "the theory of probabilities." He therefore submitted the question to a distinguished mathematician, who agreed with him in this idea, and presented the following conclusions as the probable solution of the problem: (1) of the congenitally deaf who married deaf partners, one-half married congenitally deaf partners and one-half married adventitiously deaf partners; (2) of the adventitiously deaf who married deaf partners, three-sevenths married congenitally deaf partners and four-sevenths married adventitiously deaf partners.\* The difference in the results of "the theory of probabilities" and those of the present Inquiry is probably chiefly due to the former having been based upon a smaller number of cases, in which the disparity in the proportions of the congenitally deaf and the adventitiously deaf was less than in these statistics.

Following the same order of inquiry as in the preceding chapters, let us first compare the productiveness of the marriages of the congenitally deaf and of the adventitiously deaf.

The following table includes all the marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, classified according to the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness of the partners in marriage. It shows the number of marriages of each class, and the number and percentage of them that were without offspring:

---

\*S. NEWCOMB, in Dr Bell's "Mémoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," in "Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences," Washington, 1884, vol. ii, pp. 261, 262, Reprint, Washington, 1884, pp. 85, 86. Professor Newcomb's conclusion was based upon the marriages of 629 deaf persons, of whom 298 were reported as congenitally deaf and 331 as adventitiously deaf. He made allowance "for a probable slight tendency of the two classes, congenital and non-congenital, to choose each other."

TABLE XIX.

Marriages of the deaf.	Num- ber of mar- riages.	MARRIAGES WITHOUT OFFSPRING.	
		Num- ber.	Per- cent- age.
Both partners congenitally deaf..... ..	335	55	16.418
One partner congenitally deaf; the other adventi- tiously deaf..... ..	814	127	15.602
One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unre- ported .....	120	25	20.833
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing.	191	21	10.995
One partner congenitally deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing. .... ..	17	2	11.765
Both partners adventitiously deaf..... ..	845	119	14.083
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unre- ported .....	195	26	13.333
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hear- ing .....	310	41	13.226
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing ... ..	48	3	6.250
Both partners deaf, whether congenitally or ad- ventitiously unreported..... ..	68	7	10.294
One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adven- titiously unreported, the other hearing.....	98	6	6.122
One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adven- titiously unreported; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing..... ..	37	2	5.405
Total .....	3,078	434	14.100

Summing up all the marriages of the congenitally deaf, one or both of the partners being congenitally deaf, and all the marriages of the adventitiously deaf, one or both of the partners being adventitiously deaf, as shown in Table XIX, the following table shows the number of marriages of each class, and the number and percentage of them that were without offspring:

TABLE XX.

Marriages of the deaf	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES WITHOUT OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percentage.
One or both partners congenitally deaf.....	1,477	230	15.572
One or both partners adventitiously deaf.....	2,212	316	14.286

It appears from Tables XIX and XX that a slightly larger percentage of the marriages of the congenitally deaf were without offspring than of the marriages of the adventitiously deaf.

The following table shows the number of marriages of each class that resulted in offspring, the number of children born from the marriages of each class, and the average number of children to a marriage in each class:

TABLE XXI.

Marriages of the deaf resulting in offspring.	Number of marriages.	CHILDREN.	
		Number	Average number to each marriage.
Both partners congenitally deaf ....	280	779	2.782
One partner congenitally deaf; the other adventitiously deaf.....	687	1,820	2.649
One partner congenitally deaf; the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.. ....	95	248	2.610
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing.....	170	528	3.106
One partner congenitally deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	15	26	1.733
Both partners adventitiously deaf. ....	726	1,720	2.369
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.....	169	378	2.237
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing. ....	269	713	2.651
One partner adventitiously deaf; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	45	70	1.555
Both partners deaf, whether congeni- tally or adventitiously unreported...	61	127	2.082
One partner deaf, whether congeni- tally or adventitiously unreported, the other hearing.....	92	291	3.163
One partner deaf, whether congeni- tally or adventitiously unreported; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.....	35	82	2.343
Total.....	2,644	6,782	2.565

Summing up all the marriages of the congenitally deaf that resulted in offspring, one or both of the partners being congenitally deaf, and all the marriages of the adventitiously deaf that resulted in offspring, one or both of the partners being adventitiously deaf, as shown in Table XXI, the following table shows the number of marriages of each class, the number of children born from the marriages of each class, and the average number of children to a marriage in each class:

TABLE XXII.

Marriages of the deaf resulting in offspring	Number of marriages.	CHILDREN.	
		Number	Average number to each marriage.
One or both partners congenitally deaf....	1, 247	3, 401	2. 727
One or both partners adventitiously deaf	1, 896	4, 701	2. 477

It appears from Tables XXI and XXII that the average number of children to each marriage was slightly higher in the marriages of the congenitally deaf than in those of the adventitiously deaf. This result, which is not what we should have expected from the larger percentage of marriages of the congenitally deaf that were without offspring, as shown by Tables XIX and XX, is perhaps due to the circumstance that the average duration of the marriages of the congenitally deaf here recorded was probably greater than that of the marriages of the adventitiously deaf, for a majority of the earlier pupils of American schools were congenitally deaf, while within recent years a majority of them have been adventitiously deaf.\* In

---

\* See "Deaf-Mutes: Proportion of Congenital and Adventitious Cases," in Buck's "Reference Handbook of the Medical Sciences," New York, 1886, vol. 11, p. 364.

both the marriages without offspring and those resulting in offspring, the disparities in the results of the marriages of the congenitally and the adventitiously deaf are slight. We conclude that, while there is not much difference with respect to productiveness between marriages of the congenitally deaf and of the adventitiously deaf, the latter are probably slightly more productive.

We come now to the principal question to be considered in this chapter : Are marriages of the congenitally deaf more liable than marriages of the adventitiously deaf to result in deaf offspring ?

In seeking an answer to this question, I shall pursue the same method as in the previous chapters, first regarding the 3,078 marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, and ascertaining what number and percentage of each class resulted in deaf offspring; and, secondly, regarding the 6,782 children born from these marriages, and ascertaining what number and proportion of the children born from each class of marriage were deaf.

First, regarding the marriages, and classifying them with respect to the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness of the partners in marriage, the following table shows the number of marriages of each class, and the number and percentage of them resulting in deaf offspring (with or without other offspring) :

TABLE XXIII.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Per- centage.
Both partners congenitally deaf. . . .	335	83	24.776
One partner congenitally deaf, the other adventitiously deaf. . . . .	814	66	8.108
One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported . . . .	120	17	14.165
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing. . . . .	191	28	14.660
One partner congenitally deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing. . . . .	17	.. . . .	.....
Both partners adventitiously deaf. . .	845	30	3.550
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported. . . .	195	17	8.718
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing. . . . .	310	10	3.226
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing. . . . .	48	1	2.083
Both partners deaf, whether congeni- tally or adventitiously unreported.	68	7	10.294
One partner deaf, whether congeni- tally or adventitiously unreported; the other hearing . . . . .	98	37	37.755
One partner deaf, whether congeni- tally or adventitiously unreported, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing. . . . .	37	4	10.811
Total. . . . .	3,078	300	9.746

Regarding next the children born from these marriages, the following table shows the number born from the several classes of marriage, classified according to the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness of the partners in marriage, and the number and percentage of deaf children born from the marriages of each class :

TABLE XXIV.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Per-centage.
Both partners congenitally deaf	779	202	25.931 *
One partner congenitally deaf, the other adventitiously deaf. ... ..	1,820	119	6.538
One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported. ....	248	29	11.694
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing. .... ..	528	63	11.932
One partner congenitally deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .. .. .	26	.....	.....
Both partners adventitiously deaf ....	1,720	40	2.326
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.....	378	23	6.085
One partner adventitiously deaf; the other hearing. .... ..	713	16	2.244
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.....	70	1	1.429
Both partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.	127	16	12.598
One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, the other hearing. .... ..	291	72	24.742
One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.....	82	7	8.537
Total .....	6,782	588	8.670

Regarding only the marriages of the congenitally deaf, one or both of the partners being congenitally deaf, Table XXIII gives :



TABLE XXV.

Marriages of the congenitally deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percentage.
Both partners congenitally deaf....	335	83	24.776
One partner congenitally deaf, the other adventitiously deaf .....	814	66	8.108
One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported....	120	17	14.165
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing .....	191	28	14.660
One partner congenitally deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	17	.....	.....
Total .....	1,477	194	13.135

Regarding the children born from the marriages of the congenitally deaf, one or both of the partners being congenitally deaf, Table XXIV gives :

TABLE XXVI.

	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percentage.
Both partners congenitally deaf.....	779	202	25.931
One partner congenitally deaf; the other adventitiously deaf ... ..	1,820	119	6.538
One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported .....	248	29	11.694
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing.....	528	63	11.932
One partner congenitally deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	26	.....	.....
Total.....	3,401	413	12.143

It appears from Tables XXV and XXVI that marriages of the congenitally deaf, whether they are married to one another, to adventitiously deaf partners, or to hearing partners, are very liable to result in deaf offspring; that marriages in which both of the partners are congenitally deaf are most liable to this result; that those in which one of the partners is congenitally deaf and the other a hearing person come next in order of liability; and that those in which the other partner is adventitiously deaf are least liable to result in deaf offspring.

Regarding only the marriages of the adventitiously deaf, one or both of the partners being adventitiously deaf, Table XXIII gives:

TABLE XXVII.

Marriages of the adventitiously deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Per-centage.
Both partners adventitiously deaf.....	845	30	3.550
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other congenitally deaf .... ..	814	66	8.108
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.....	195	17	8.718
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing..... ..	310	10	3.226
One partner adventitiously deaf; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing .....	48	1	2.083
Total .....	2,212	124	5.606

Regarding the children born from the marriages of the adventitiously deaf, one or both of the partners being adventitiously deaf, Table XXIV gives:

TABLE XXVIII.

Marriages of the adventitiously deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Per-centage.
Both partners adventitiously deaf . . .	1,720	40	2.326
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other congenitally deaf . . . . .	1,820	119	6.538
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported . . . . .	378	23	6.085
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing. . . . .	713	16	2.244
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing . . . . .	70	1	1.429
Total .. . . .	4,701	199	4.233

It appears from Tables XXVII and XXVIII that marriages of the adventitiously deaf, whether they are married to one another, to congenitally deaf partners, or to hearing partners, are somewhat liable to result in deaf offspring; that the liability is greatest in marriages in which the other partner is congenitally deaf; and that those in which both of the partners are adventitiously deaf are slightly more liable to result in deaf offspring than those in which one of the partners is adventitiously deaf and the other a hearing person.

The totals of Tables XXV and XXVII show the marriages of the congenitally deaf and the adventitiously deaf, respectively, one or both of the partners being deaf, and the number and percentage of marriages of each class resulting in deaf offspring (with or without other offspring), as follows :

TABLE XXIX.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
One or both partners congenitally deaf..... ..	1, 477	194	13.135
One or both partners adventitiously deaf..... ..	2, 212	124	5.606

The totals of Tables XXVI and XXVIII show the number and percentage of deaf children resulting from marriages of the congenitally deaf and the adventitiously deaf, respectively, as follows :

TABLE XXX.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
One or both partners congenitally deaf..... ..	3, 401	413	12.143
One or both partners adventitiously deaf..... ..	4, 701	199	4.233

It appears from Tables XXIX and XXX that a far larger proportion of the marriages of the congenitally deaf resulted in deaf offspring than of the adventitiously deaf, and that a far larger proportion of deaf children were born from the former than from the latter. The disparity in the percentages of the results of the two classes of marriages becomes still greater if we regard only the marriages in which the condition of both partners was reported, and omit the large number of marriages in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other adventitiously deaf, as is shown in the two following tables :

TABLE XXXI.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percentage.
One partner congenitally deaf, the other congenitally deaf or hearing.	526	111	21.103
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other adventitiously deaf or hearing .....	1,155	40	3.463
Total..... ..	1,681	151	9.458

TABLE XXXII.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percentage.
One partner congenitally deaf, the other congenitally deaf or hearing	1,307	265	20.275
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other adventitiously deaf or hearing .. ..	2,433	56	2.301
Total... ..	3,740	321	8.583

The principal question of this chapter, then, must be answered in the affirmative. Marriages of the congenitally deaf are far more liable to result in deaf offspring than marriages of the adventitiously deaf.

This conclusion is in accordance with the generally accepted law of heredity that congenital or innate characteristics are far more likely to be transmitted to the offspring than acquired characteristics. Indeed, some of the most eminent hereditarians believe that acquired characteristics are never transmitted. In the case of deafness reappearing in the offspring, if we fall into the common error of regarding deafness as the characteristic transmitted, we must conclude at once that an acquired characteristic may be

transmitted; for, as is shown by Tables XXVII and XXVIII, a certain percentage of the marriages of the adventitiously deaf with one another—small, it is true, in comparison with that of the marriages of the congenitally deaf (Tables XXV and XXVI), but much larger than that of marriages in which both of the partners are hearing persons—result in deaf offspring. But when we remember that what is transmitted is not really deafness, but some physical anomaly or tendency to disease of which deafness is but the consequence or the symptom, and that this anomaly or tendency may have been congenital in the parent though deafness did not occur until some later period in life, we see that, even where marriages of adventitiously deaf persons result in deaf offspring, it is possible that the characteristic transmitted may really be a congenital and not an acquired one. This is an interesting topic, but to inquire into it further at present would draw us too far away from the main subject under consideration.

Although the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring and of deaf children born therefrom, as shown by Tables XXIII and XXIV, is much higher where both of the partners were congenitally deaf than where one of them was congenitally deaf and the other a hearing person, it does not appear that this higher percentage is chiefly due, as has been assumed by some writers, to an intensification of the liability to deaf offspring caused by the union of "like with like." It seems rather to be due to the fact that, where both of the partners were congenitally deaf, there were two persons instead of one liable to transmit the physical condition that results in deafness. This is still more apparent from the following table, which shows the number of congenitally deaf persons married for a year or longer to congenitally deaf and to hearing partners respectively, of whose marriages the results are reported, the number of deaf children born from these marriages, and the number born to every 100 congenitally deaf married persons in each class of marriage:

TABLE XXXIII.

Congenitally deaf persons married to congenitally deaf partners or to hearing partners.	Number of congenitally deaf married persons.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Number born to every 100 congenitally deaf married persons
Congenitally deaf persons married to congenitally deaf partners .....	655	202	30.839
Congenitally deaf persons married to hearing partners.. .....	184	63	34.239
Total * .....	831	265	31.889

If the 655 congenitally deaf persons who married congenitally deaf partners had married hearing partners instead, and if the proportion of deaf children born from such marriages had been as large as it was in the case of the 184 congenitally deaf persons who did marry hearing partners, the number of deaf children born would have been 224 instead of 202. There seems, therefore, even in the marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf, to have been no intensification of the liability to deaf offspring caused by the union of "like with like."

This result is contrary to the opinion that has been expressed by some distinguished investigators who have considered the subject. In 1868, Dr. W. W. Turner, ex-Principal of the American School at Hartford for the Deaf, applying to marriages of the deaf certain deductions drawn from experiments in the breeding of domestic animals, concluded that the tendency to the inheritance of deafness by the offspring was greatly intensified when congenitally deaf persons married congenitally deaf partners. "It is a well-known fact as regards domestic animals," he said, "that certain unusual variations of form or

\* Eight congenitally deaf persons were married both to congenitally deaf and to hearing partners.

color which sometimes occur among their offspring may, by a careful selection of others similar, and by a continued breeding of like with like, be rendered permanent, so as to constitute a distinct variety, as in the case of horses, sheep, and swine. The same course adopted and pursued in the human race would, undoubtedly, lead to the same result.

\* \* \* If a person born deaf marry one who was not, there is a probability that there may be a deaf-mute among their children. \* \* \* The amount of deafness transmitted in such cases is so small that interference can hardly be justified. But if two congenitally deaf-mutes intermarry and have children, the probability that there will be congenital deafness among them becomes so great \* \* \* that every consideration of philanthropy, as well as the interests of congenitally deaf persons themselves, should induce their teachers and friends to urge upon them the impropriety of such intermarriages.”\*

Dr. Turner's views attracted little attention at the time, but their citation with approval in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*† doubtless had considerable influence upon public opinion. Still wider publicity and greater prominence were given them a few years later by their adoption and promulgation by Dr. Alexander Graham Bell.‡ Dr. Bell laid special emphasis upon the more remote results which he believed would follow marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf, formulating the theory thus: “If the laws of heredity that are known to hold in the case of animals also apply to man, the intermarriage of congenital deaf-mutes through a num-

---

\* W. W. TURNER, “Hereditary Deafness,” in “Proceedings of the First Conference of Principals of American Schools for the Deaf,” Washington, 1868, pp. 91-96

† A. LARGE, “Deaf and Dumb,” in “*Encyclopædia Britannica*,” ninth edition, vol. vii, pp. 6 and 7.

‡ A. G. BELL, “Mémorial upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race,” in “*Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*,” Washington, 1884, vol. ii, pp. 177-262. Reprinted separately, Washington, 1884.



ber of successive generations should result in the formation of a deaf variety of the human race."\* The theory as thus formulated has been accepted by such eminent men of science as Francis Galton in England,† Alphonse de Candolle in Switzerland,‡ and Professors Edward D. Cope, Alpheus Hyatt, H. P. Bowditch, William H. Brewer, Simon Newcomb, and W. K. Brooks in America.§

We cannot doubt that "the laws of heredity that are known to hold in the case of animals also apply to man," and we cannot believe that the deaf in this respect are an exception to mankind in general. But since it appears from this large body of statistics that the proportion of deaf children to deaf persons married is not greater where both of the partners were deaf, nor even where both of them were congenitally deaf, than where one of them was a hearing person,|| it follows that either there

---

\* *Ibid.*, p. 180, Reprint, p. 4

† F. GALTON, "Hereditary Deafness," in "Nature," London, 1885, vol. xxxi, pp. 269, 270.

‡ A. DE CANDOLLE, "Sur la Production par Sélection aux États-Unis d'une Race de Sourds-Muets, d'après M. Alex Graham Bell," in "Archives des Sciences physiques et naturelles," Geneva, 1886, vol. xv, pp. 50-64. Reprinted separately, Geneva, 1886.

§ "Scientific Testimony," in "Facts and Opinions relating to the Deaf from America," London, 1881, pp. 89-106. Reprinted in "Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb," etc., London, 1889, vol. ii, pp. 319-324, and in "Education of Deaf Children," Washington, 1892, part n, pp. 101-106.

|| It will probably surprise persons who have not analyzed Dr. Turner's statistics carefully to learn that those statistics, like these, showed a larger proportion of deaf children to deaf persons who married hearing partners, and even to congenitally deaf persons who married hearing partners, than to those who married deaf partners. Dr. Turner evidently did not perceive this fact, but Dr. Bell perceived it and commented upon it. "In the case of the American Asylum," Dr. Bell says, "it appears that the pupils who married hearing persons had a larger proportion of deaf children than those who married deaf-mutes," and "even in the case of the congenitally deaf pupils of the American Asylum it appears that those who married hearing persons had a larger proportion of deaf offspring than those who married deaf-mutes" ("Memoir," etc., Reprint, p. 24). Dr. Bell (*Ibid.*, p. 25) made an analysis of these and other cases,

must be some exceptions to the general law of heredity that the tendency to the transmission of characteristics is intensified by the union of "like with like," or else that there must be some fallacy in the application of this law to the marriages of the deaf.

That any congenital characteristic is more likely to be transmitted to the offspring when it exists in both parents than when it exists in only one parent is doubtless generally true, but it is not invariably the rule. Darwin gives several examples in which peculiarities belonging to both parents "fail to be inherited, apparently from the force of heredity being too strong,"\* and says that, "contrary to the common opinion, it is often sufficient for the inheritance of some peculiar character that one parent alone should possess it."† Mr. W. Sedgwick, in commenting upon some statistics showing that marriages in which both of the parents were deaf seldom resulted in deaf offspring, suggests that it may be owing to "excess having reversed the action of some natural law in development;"‡ and Ribot, the eminent French authority on heredity, quoting Mr. Sedgwick's suggestion without expressing dissent, says: "Many physiologists have thought that when both parents present the same characteristics heredity may acquire such power as to destroy itself."§ Darwin also cites Mr. Sedgwick's remark, but wisely adds that "it is

---

as searching and exhaustive as the data at his command permitted, and, in view of the large proportion of deaf offspring resulting from marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person, suggested the explanation, which will be considered in a future chapter, that in a majority of these marriages the deaf partner was probably congenitally deaf, and the hearing partner probably belonged to a family containing deaf persons.

\* C R DARWIN, "The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication," New York, 1868, vol. II, p. 33.

† *Ibid.*, p. 39.

‡ W. SEDGWICK, "On Sexual Limitation in Hereditary Disease," in "British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review," London, 1861, vol. XXVIII, p. 204.

§ T. RIBOT, "Heredity. a Psychological Study of its Phenomena, Laws, Causes, and Consequences," New York, 1875, p. 212.

safer in the present state of our knowledge to look at the whole case as simply unintelligible.”\*

The present statistics, which include a much larger number of cases than Mr. Sedgwick had before him, do not corroborate the view suggested by him ; for while they show a smaller percentage of deaf offspring to deaf married persons, and even to congenitally deaf married persons, in marriages in which both of the partners were deaf than in those in which one of them was a hearing person, the large number of marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf that resulted in deaf offspring indicate that heredity in such cases does not “acquire such power as to destroy itself.” On the other hand, Darwin’s statement that, “contrary to the common opinion, it is often sufficient for the inheritance of some peculiar character that one parent alone should possess it,” is corroborated by these statistics.

The fallacy in applying to marriages of the deaf the law of heredity concerning the results of the union of “like with like” lies, I believe, not in the direction suggested by Mr. Sedgwick, but in the erroneous assumption, made by nearly all the writers who have discussed this subject, that, when the deafness of the parent reappears in the offspring, deafness is the characteristic transmitted. As has already been stated, what is really transmitted is not deafness, but some anomaly of the auditory organs or of the nervous system, or the tendency to some disease, of which deafness is but the result or the symptom. These anomalies and diseases, of which deafness is the result or the symptom, are many and various. “Hereditary deafness in some of its aspects is like hereditary cough ; both are the result of a great number of possible physical states.”† “Deafness no more implies one defect or

---

\* C. R. DARWIN, “The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication,” New York, 1868, vol. ii, p. 34.

† W. G. JENKINS, “Heredity in its Relation to Deafness,” in “American Annals of the Deaf,” Washington, 1891, vol. xxxvi, p. 104.

disease than cough or jaundice does. The cough may be due to bronchitis or phthisis, the jaundice to cancer or gall-stones. \* \* \* Congenital deafness \* \* \* is due not to one, but to many different and unconnected pathological conditions."\* Now, if a person who is deaf from one anomaly or disease of the auditory organs, or of the nervous system, marries a partner who is deaf from some different and unconnected pathological condition, the law of heredity under consideration should not lead us to expect any intensification of the liability to transmit the defect, for the characteristics existing in the two partners are not the same. Although both partners are deaf, their marriage is not a union of "like with like" from a physiological point of view, and the law does not apply to their case. On the other hand, where the physical condition that results in deafness is the same in both partners—as, for instance, it probably is in a class of marriages of which these records furnish some examples, which will be considered in a future chapter, viz., consanguineous marriages of deaf persons—we should expect the liability to deaf offspring to be intensified by their union; but marriages of this kind are probably less numerous than those in which the physical conditions of the partners are different.

It appears from the following table that in marriages of the adventitiously deaf, also, the proportion of deaf offspring to the number of deaf married persons is less where both of the partners were adventitiously deaf than where one of them was adventitiously deaf and the other a hearing person. The disparity in the percentage of deaf children born from the two classes of marriages of adventitiously deaf persons, however, is far greater than that from the two classes of marriages of congenitally deaf persons. The table shows the number of adven-

---

\*J. K. LOVE, "Deaf-Mutism, a Clinical and Pathological Study," Glasgow, 1896, pp. 101, 103.

titionally deaf persons married for a year or longer to adventitiously deaf and to hearing partners respectively, of whose marriages the results are reported, the number of deaf children born from these marriages, and the number born to every 100 adventitiously deaf married persons in each class of marriage :

TABLE XXXIV.

Adventitiously deaf persons married to adventitiously deaf partners or to hearing partners	Number of adventitiously deaf married persons.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number	Number born to every 100 adventitiously deaf married persons.
Adventitiously deaf persons married to adventitiously deaf partners.....	1,656	40	2.415
Adventitiously deaf persons married to hearing partners.....	305	16	5.246
Total*.....	1,946	56	2.877

If the 1,656 adventitiously deaf persons who married adventitiously deaf partners had married hearing partners instead, and if the proportion of deaf children born from such marriages had been as large as it was in the case of the 305 adventitiously deaf persons who did marry hearing partners, the number of deaf children born would have been 86 instead of 40.

If the explanation above suggested of the fallacy underlying the theory of an intensified liability to "hereditary deafness," supposed to be caused by the union of "like with like," is correct, we see why the percentage of deaf offspring to deaf married persons should not be very much greater in marriages in which both of the partners are

\*Fifteen adventitiously deaf persons were married both to adventitiously deaf and to hearing partners.

deaf than in those in which one of them is deaf and the other a hearing person ; but why should the percentage be, as it is in the case of the adventitiously deaf and of the deaf taken as a whole, very much less? This question will be considered in a future chapter, after we have examined some other and entirely different classifications of the deaf.

## CHAPTER IV.

### MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF, ONE OR BOTH OF THE PARTNERS HAVING DEAF RELATIVES.

IN the preceding chapters some of the most important of the questions proposed at the outset of this Inquiry have been answered, but we are not yet prepared to advise the deaf how to choose their partners in marriage with a view to diminishing their liability to deaf offspring. If we should stop at the conclusions thus far reached, the only advice we could give would be that the congenitally deaf, if they married at all, should marry the adventitiously deaf, and that the adventitiously deaf should marry one another. But if the congenitally deaf should follow this advice, their adventitiously deaf partners would be compelled to disregard it; and no opportunity would be left for members of either class to follow the choice of their own hearts in case they should wish to marry congenitally deaf or hearing persons. Happily, another classification of the deaf may be made besides that based upon the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness, and one that promises to yield more satisfactory results.

In the statistics gathered by the heads of schools for the deaf, as pupils were brought for admission from time to time, it was early observed that the occurrence of two or more deaf persons in a family was by no means rare, and that a large number of the pupils had other deaf relatives, as uncles, aunts, and cousins. So long ago as 1854, Dr. H. P. Peet expressed the opinion that the hearing brothers and sisters of a deaf person were about as liable

to have deaf children as the deaf person himself, "supposing each to marry into families that have, or each to marry into families that have not, shown a predisposition toward deaf-dumbness."\* Dr. Turner, in 1868, referred to the existence of deafness in collateral branches of certain families as an argument in support of his theory of "Hereditary Deafness."† Dr. Bell, in 1883, quoting the opinion of Dr. Peet above cited, and referring to the fact that in the majority of cases that had fallen under his own personal observation where a deaf person was married to a hearing partner the latter belonged to a family containing deaf persons, reached this conclusion: "A hereditary tendency towards deafness, as indicated by the possession of deaf relatives, is a most important element in determining the production of deaf offspring.

\* \* \* It may even be a more important element than the mere fact of congenital deafness in one or both of the parents."‡ In the present Inquiry, therefore, an effort was made to ascertain, as far as possible, whether the partners in marriage had deaf relatives, and, if so, what was the relationship.

In tabulating the returns of deaf relatives, I started out with the hypothesis that, if the possession of deaf relatives were a factor in the problem, the relationship of deaf brother or sister would be the most important one as an indication of the liability to deaf offspring, and I therefore at first made a general tabulation of the results of the marriages in which one or both of the partners had deaf brother or sister, one or more, with or without other

---

\* H. P. PEET, "List of Pupils of the New York Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb," in "American Annals of the Deaf," Hartford, 1854, vol. vi, p. 235.

† W. W. TURNER, "Hereditary Deafness," in "Proceedings of the First Conference of Principals of American Schools for the Deaf," Washington, 1868.

‡ A. G. BELL, "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," Reprint, Washington, 1884, p. 25.



deaf relatives, separately from those of the marriages in which one or both of the partners had other deaf relatives (not including descendants), but not deaf brother or sister. Contrary to my expectation, the results proved that the percentages of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, were nearly the same for these two classes, the difference being only between one and two per cent., and in some combinations favoring the first class and in others the second. The total number of marriages of the second class, moreover, proved to be comparatively small, those in which both of the partners had other deaf relatives, but not deaf brother or sister, being only about one per cent. of the whole number of marriages, and those in which one but not the other of the partners was thus conditioned being only about  $11\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. In view of these results, and of the additional circumstance that the separation of the two classes would have added greatly to the length and complication of the tables in which the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives is shown in connection with the existence of congenital or adventitious deafness or of hearing, it was decided to combine the two classes. Deaf descendants are not included in the tabulation.

The 8,504 partners in marriage comprised in these records are classified as follows with respect to the possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants):

TABLE XXXV.

marriage	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives ....	2,496	29.351
Had no deaf relatives . . . . .	2,169	25.506
No information concealing deaf relatives reported .....	3,839	45.143
Total.....	8,504	100.000

We do not know what proportion of married people in general have deaf relatives, but the percentage is certainly very much less than that shown in the above table and in the tables that follow, both of the married deaf and of their hearing partners in marriage. It seems probable, then, at the outset, that the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives will prove an important factor in the solution of the questions under consideration.

The number and percentage of the deaf married persons who had deaf relatives (not including descendants) are shown in the following table:

TABLE XXXVI

Deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives..... ..	2,420	33.255
Had no deaf relatives.... ..	2,081	28.597
No information concerning deaf relatives reported . . . . .	2,776	38.148
	7,277	100.000

Regarding only the deaf married persons concerning whom it is reported whether they had deaf relatives or not, we have:

TABLE XXXVII.

Deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives ..... ..	2,420	53.766
Had no deaf relatives . . . . .	2,081	46.234
Total ..... ..	4,501	100.000

The proportion of the married deaf having deaf relatives, as shown by Table XXXVII, is larger than that of 17,883 pupils who attended American schools for the deaf up to the year 1890, of whom 7,516, or 42 per cent., were reported as having deaf relatives.\* This difference

\* See "School Statistics of the Deaf," in "Proceedings of the World's Congress of Instructors of the Deaf," Washington, 1893, p. 276.

is probably due chiefly to the fact that the deaf relatives of the married deaf were ascertained in many cases at a later date than those of the "School Statistics," additional deaf relatives having been born in the interval.

The number and percentage of the congenitally deaf married persons who had deaf relatives (not including descendants) are shown in the following table :

TABLE XXXVIII.

Congenitally deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives..... .	1,461	65.078
Had no deaf relatives .... .	314	13.987
No information concerning deaf relatives reported..... .	470	20.935
Total..... .	2,245	100.000

The number and percentage of the adventitiously deaf married persons who had deaf relatives (not including descendants) are shown in the following table :

TABLE XXXIX.

Adventitiously deaf married persons.	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives .. .	794	20.086
Had no deaf relatives .. .	1,707	43.182
No information concerning deaf relatives reported..... .	1,452	36.732
Total .. .	3,953	100.000

It appears from a comparison of Tables XXXVIII and XXXIX that the proportion of those who had deaf relatives is far larger among the congenitally deaf than among the adventitiously deaf, while the proportion of those who had no deaf relatives is far larger among the adventitiously deaf. This indicates a close connection between the existence of congenital deafness and the possession of deaf relatives.

The number and percentage of the hearing partners in marriage who had deaf relatives (not including descendants) are shown in the following table :

TABLE XL.

Hearing partners in marriage.	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives .....	72	8.072
Had no deaf relatives .....	87	9.753
No information concerning deaf relatives reported.....	733	82.175
Total. ....	892	100.000

It is a matter of regret that the questions with respect to deaf relatives of hearing partners were left unanswered in so large a proportion of the marriage records. The source from which, in many cases, information was obtained concerning the deaf relatives of the deaf married persons—the school records—did not exist with respect to the hearing partners, and the collectors of the marriage records did not all realize the importance of making special efforts to obtain full details concerning relationships, especially with respect to hearing partners. Efforts to fill the lacunæ by further correspondence were sometimes successful but oftener unsuccessful.

Regarding only the hearing partners in marriage concerning whom it is reported whether they had deaf relatives or not, we have :

TABLE XLI.

Hearing partners in marriage.	Number.	Percentage.
Had deaf relatives .....	72	45.283
Had no deaf relatives.....	87	54.717
Total.....	159	100.000

The circumstance that so large a proportion of hearing persons having deaf relatives married deaf partners, as shown by the above table—certainly a much larger proportion than the percentage of hearing persons having deaf relatives to hearing persons in general, though we do not know just what that percentage is—is probably chiefly due to one or more of the following reasons: (1) they became acquainted with the deaf persons whom they married through their own deaf relatives; (2) being accustomed to communicate with the deaf, they were able to communicate with these persons more easily and freely than were hearing people in general; (3) they were drawn towards them with peculiar interest and sympathy on account of having deaf relatives of their own. *Vice versa*, similar reasons would account for the fact that so many deaf persons married hearing partners having deaf relatives.

We come now to the principal questions to be considered in this chapter, viz: (1) Is the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives by one or both of the partners in marriage a trustworthy indication of liability or non-liability to deaf offspring? (2) Is it a more trustworthy indication than the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness of one or both of the partners?

In seeking an answer to these questions I shall pursue the same method as in the previous chapters, regarding first the marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, and ascertaining what number and percentage of each class of marriage resulted in deaf offspring; and, secondly, regarding the children born from these marriages, and ascertaining what number and proportion of the children born from each class of marriage were deaf.

Beginning with the classes of marriage that were considered in Chapter III—the marriages of the congenitally deaf and of the adventitiously deaf—let us see how

their respective percentages of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, are affected by the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives.

The following table shows the marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE XLII.

Both partners congenitally deaf.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.. . .	172	49	28.488
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. . . . .	49	8	16.326
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	73	17	23.288
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....	14	1	7.143
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .. . . .	2	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ...	25	8	32.000
Total.	335	83	24.776

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf :

TABLE XLIII.

Both partners congenitally deaf.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . .	429	130	30.303
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not..... . . . .	105	21	20.000
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf rela- tives of the other partner reported.	159	32	20.126
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....	24	1	4.167
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf rela- tives of the other partner reported.	1	...	.....
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of either partner reported	61	18	29.508
Total .....	779	202	25.931

Of the marriage concerning which it is reported in Tables XLII and XLIII that neither partner had deaf relatives and a deaf child was born, there are two records. One, coming from the school where the partners were educated, contains no information concerning deaf relatives. The other record, from which the statement that neither partner had deaf relatives is derived, comes from a person belonging to another family and residing in another town, and in general gives such meagre details as to show that its author had but little acquaintance with the family of either partner. Under these circumstances the statement that neither partner had deaf relatives may be regarded as of doubtful authenticity. If we eliminate this marriage from the tables, there remains not a single instance of marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf and neither had deaf relatives, that resulted in deaf offspring.

The conclusions to be drawn from the statistics of these tables and of those that follow, as to the relative importance of congenital or adventitious deafness and the pos-

session or non-possession of deaf relatives as an indication of liability or non-liability to deaf offspring, are reserved until all the various classes that have been considered in the preceding chapters shall have been examined to see how their respective percentages of deaf offspring are affected by the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives.

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other adventitiously deaf, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE XLIV.

One partner congenitally deaf, the other adventitiously deaf.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . . .	141	24	17.021
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. . . . .	260	14	5.384
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	189	18	9.524
Neither partner had deaf relatives. . .	100	3	3.000
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	46	2	4.348
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ....	78	5	6.410
Total . . . . .	814	66	8.108

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other adventitiously deaf :



TABLE XLV.

One partner congenitally deaf; the other adventitiously deaf.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . . .	321	35	10.903
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not.....	578	32	5.536
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported	434	38	8.203
Neither partner had deaf relatives ..	264	4	1.515
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported	73	2	2.740
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported...	150	8	5.333
Total .....	1,820	119	6.538

Regarding the three marriages resulting in four deaf children, of which it is reported in Tables XLIV and XLV that neither of the partners had deaf relatives, the statement with respect to two of them comes from their school records. With respect to the third, the school record gives no information concerning deaf relatives, but it says that one of the partners was admitted to school from an almshouse, and that he bore his mother's name, and it was not known who his father was. The statement that he had no deaf relatives, which comes from a person belonging to another family and residing in another town, cannot therefore be accepted as well authenticated. If we eliminate this marriage from the tables, the percentage of marriages of this class resulting in deaf offspring is reduced to 2.02 and the percentage of deaf children born therefrom to 1.14.

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf, and the other was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the

number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring:

TABLE XLVI

One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.	Number of Marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. ....	20		25.000
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .... ..	10		20.000
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.			10 714
Neither partner had deaf relatives.. ..			
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported. . . . .	6	1	16.667
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	25	3	12.000
Total	120	17	14.167

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf, and the other was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported:

TABLE XLVII.

One partner congenitally deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives ....	53	14	26 415
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not ..... .	17	2	11.765
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	101	6	5.941
Neither partner had deaf relatives ....	6	.....	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .....	17	2	11.765
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	54	5	9.259
Total..	248	29	11.694

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other was a hearing person, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE XLVIII.

One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives... ..	20	7	35.000
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not . . . . .	14	1	7.143
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	104	12	11.538
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....	7	2	28.571
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.....	16	1	6.250
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	30	5	16.667
Total .	191	28	14.660

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other was a hearing person :

TABLE XLIX.

One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.. ....	70	17	24.286
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not ... ..	59	7	11.864
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported	285	27	9.474
Neither partner had deaf relatives .....	19	3	15.789
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	28	1	3.571
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported....	67	8	11.940
Total .... ..	528	63	11.932

The class of marriages in which neither of the partners had deaf relatives, as shown in Tables XLVIII and XLIX, gives a large percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring and of deaf children born therefrom, thus differing from all the marriages of this class reported in the other tables. It will be observed, however, that the total number of marriages of this class reported in Tables XLVIII and XLIX is only seven.

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants) :

TABLE L.

One partner congenitally deaf; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives...	2	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .. . . .	.....	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	7	.....	.....
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....	1	.....	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported..	3	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ..	4	.....	.....
Total.. .. .	17	.....	.....

The following table shows the number of children born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was congenitally deaf and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing :

TABLE LI.

One partner congenitally deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.. .			
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .. . . .			
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.			
Neither partner had deaf relatives .. .			
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported			
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ..			
Total.. .. .	26		

The following table shows the marriages in which both of the partners were adventitiously deaf, classified accord-

ing to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LII

Both partners adventitiously deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives	57	10	17.544
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .....	167	7	4.191
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	92		6.522
Neither partner had deaf relatives ....	284		0.704
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	83		
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported...	162	5	3.086
Total	845	30	3.550

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which both of the partners were adventitiously deaf :

TABLE LIII.

Both partners adventitiously deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. .	114	11	9.649
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .....	357	10	2.801
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	202	10	4.950
Neither partner had deaf relatives ....	550	2	0.364
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	163	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported...	334	7	2.096
Total.	1,720	40	2.326

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was adventitiously deaf, and the other was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LIV.

One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives	8	3	37.500
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not.....	12	1	8.333
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	49	8	16.326
Neither partner had deaf relatives..	12	2	16.667
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	49	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.	65	3	4.615
Total.....	195	17	8.718

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was adventitiously deaf, and the other was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported :

TABLE LV.

One partner adventitiously deaf, the other deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.....	27	5	18.518
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. ....	30	1	3.333
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.....	98	10	10.204
Neither partner had deaf relatives . . .	27	2	7.407
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	76	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported., ...	120	5	4.167
Total ..... . . . .	378	23	6.085

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was adventitiously deaf and the other was a hearing person, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LVI.

One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . ....	9	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not.....	23	1	4.348
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported..	40	4	10.000
Neither partner had deaf relatives ....	48	1	2.083
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	90	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	100	4	4.000
Total ..... . . . .	310	10	3.226



The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was adventitiously deaf and the other was a hearing person :

TABLE LVII

One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives ...	21	.... .	....
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. ....	46	1	2.174
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .	89	9	10.112
Neither partner had deaf relatives .	143	1	0.699
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported	181	....	....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ....	233	5	2.146
Total .	713	16	2.244

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was adventitiously deaf and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LVIII.

One partner adventitiously deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.....			
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .....			
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .			
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....			
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .....	15		
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	30		3.333
Total	48		2.083

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was adventitiously deaf and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing :

TABLE LIX.

One partner adventitiously deaf; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.. ....			
One partner had deaf relatives; the other had not.....			
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported..	3		
Neither partner had deaf relatives... ..			
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .....	20		
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported .....	47	1	2.128
Total.....	70	1	1.429

The following table shows the marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LX.

Both partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. ...			50.000
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not ... ..			100.000
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .	14		7.143
Neither partner had deaf relatives . ...	1		
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	3		
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ...	45		6.667
Total.	68		10.294

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which both of the partners were deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported :

TABLE LXI.

Both partners deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . . . .	12	6	50.000
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not . . . . .	5	2	40.000
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported		2	8.696
Neither partner had deaf relatives .		...	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported	9	...	...
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ...	75	6	8.000
Total .	127	16	12.598

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and the other a hearing person, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring:

TABLE LXII.

One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, the other hearing	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. . . .	3	3	100.000
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. . . . .	5	1	20.000
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .....	35	15	42.857
Neither partner had deaf relatives ...	1	.....	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	3	1	33.333
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	51	17	33.333
Total .	98	37	37.755

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and the other was a hearing person :

TABLE LXIII.

One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, the other hearing	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.. ...	10	4	40 000
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .....	13	2	15 385
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported .. ...	124	35	28 226
Neither partner had deaf relatives.. ...	5	.....	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	2	2	100 000
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported ..	137	29	21.168
Total.....	291	72	24.742

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LXIV.

One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.....			
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .....			
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.			50.000
Neither partner had deaf relatives ..			
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.....	2		
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported.....	32		9.375
Total..	37		10.811

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing:

TABLE LXV.

One partner deaf, whether congenitally or adventitiously unreported, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. ....			
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not .. ...			
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.			50.000
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....			
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.....	1		
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported .....	73		5.479
Total .....			8.537

It appears from Tables XLII to LXV, inclusive, that however the marriages of the deaf are classified with respect to the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness of one or of both of the partners, or the hearing of one of the partners, the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and the percentage of deaf children born therefrom, are almost invariably highest where both of the partners had deaf relatives, next highest where one of them had deaf relatives, and least where neither had deaf relatives; the only exceptions being in classes where the totals are too small to be regarded as important.

Let us now examine the classes of marriage that were considered in Chapter II,—marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, and those in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person—and see how their respective percentages of deaf children are affected by the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives.

The following table shows the marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring:

TABLE LXVI.

Both partners deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. . . .	402	93	23.134
One partner had deaf relatives; the other had not . . . . .	499	33	6.613
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf rela- tives of the other partner reported.	473	56	11.839
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....	414	8	1.932
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf rela- tives of the other partner reported	189	3	1.586
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of either partner reported.....	400	27	6.750
Total .....	2,377	220	9.255

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which both of the partners were deaf:

TABLE LXVII.

Both partners deaf	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . .	956	201	21.025
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. . . . .	1,092	68	6.227
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.. .	1,017	98	9.633
Neither partner had deaf relatives .....	874	9	1.030
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	339	4	1.180
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported... ..	794	49	6.171
Total .....	5,072	429	8.458

If we eliminate the two marriages mentioned on pages 72 and 74, in respect to which the statements that neither of the partners had deaf relatives are not well authenticated, the number of marriages of this class resulting in deaf offspring is reduced to 6, giving a percentage of 1.456, and the number of deaf children born therefrom is reduced to 7, giving a percentage of 0.803.

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring:



TABLE LXVIII.

One partner deaf, the other hearing.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives.....	32	10	31.250
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not. . . . .	42	3	7.143
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported	179	31	17.318
Neither partner had deaf relatives..	56	3	5.357
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	109	2	1.835
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported. .	181	26	14.365
Total . . . . .	599	75	12.521

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person :

TABLE LXIX

One partner deaf, the other hearing	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives... ..	101	21	20.792
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not.....	118	10	8.475
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	498	71	14.257
Neither partner had deaf relatives.....	167	4	2.395
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	211	3	1.422
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported...	437	42	9.611
Total .....	1,532	151	9.856

The following table shows the marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LXX.

One partner deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number	Percent'e
Both partners had deaf relatives.....	3	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not.....	.....	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	12	1	8 333
Neither partner had deaf relatives ....	1	.....	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported..	20	.....	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported....	66	4	6.061
Total . . . . .	102	5	4.902

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was deaf and the other was unreported whether deaf or hearing .

TABLE LXXI.

One partner deaf; the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent's.
Both partners had deaf relatives. ....	3	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not ....	.....	.....	.....
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	17	3	17.647
Neither partner had deaf relatives.. ...	3	... ..	.....
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	27	... .	.....
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported...	128	5	3.906
Total... .	178	8	4.494

It appears from Tables LXVI to LXXI, inclusive, that, however the marriages of the deaf are classified with respect to the deafness of one or both of the partners, the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, are almost invariably highest where both of the partners had deaf relatives, next highest where one of them had deaf relatives, and least where neither had deaf relatives; the only exceptions being in classes where the totals are too small to be regarded as important.

Let us, finally, examine all the marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, one or both of the partners being deaf, and see how the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is affected by the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants). This is shown in the following table:

TABLE LXXII.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. . . .	437	103	23.570
One partner had deaf relatives; the other had not . . . . .	541	36	6.654
One partner had deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	664	88	13.253
Neither partner had deaf relatives . .	471	11	2.335
One partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported.	318	5	1.572
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported. . . .	647	57	8.810
Total	3,078	300	9.747

The following table shows the number of children born from these several classes of marriages, and the number and percentage of deaf children belonging to each class :

TABLE LXXIII.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives . . . .	1,060	222	20.943
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not . . . . .	1,210	78	6.446
One partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported..	1,532	172	11.227
Neither partner had deaf relatives . . .	1,044	13	1.245
One partner had no deaf relatives; no information concerning deaf relatives of the other partner reported..	577	7	1.213
No information concerning deaf relatives of either partner reported. . . . .	1,359	96	7.064
Total . . . . .	6,782	588	8.670

If we eliminate the two marriages mentioned on pages 72 and 74, in respect to which the statements that neither

of the partners had deaf relatives are not well authenticated, the number of marriages of this class resulting in deaf offspring is reduced to nine, giving a percentage of 1.92, and the number of deaf children born therefrom is reduced to eleven, giving a percentage of 1.056. These nine records come from the schools where the partners in marriage were educated or from the partners themselves, and may be accepted as authentic; but when we consider how many persons, especially in America, where changes of residence are frequent, are unacquainted with the condition of all their relatives, it seems not improbable that marriages of this class resulting in deaf offspring are even fewer than here reported.

The statistics above given (Tables XLII to LXXIII, inclusive) fully corroborate Dr. Bell's conclusion that "a hereditary tendency towards deafness, as indicated by the possession of deaf relatives, is a most important element in determining the production of deaf offspring," and that "it may even be a more important element than the mere fact of congenital deafness in one or both of the parents."\* Indeed, we may go further and say that while congenital deafness may be regarded as a *prima facie* indication of a liability to deaf offspring, it should never be accepted as a conclusive indication of such liability; for where congenital deafness is unattended by the possession of deaf relatives the liability, if it exists at all, is very slight, and should not be regarded as a bar to marriage.

The possession or non-possession of deaf relatives has another advantage over the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness, as an indication of liability or non-liability to deaf offspring, viz., that the former is an element the existence or non-existence of which can be definitely ascertained, while the latter is not. As has

---

\*A. G. BELL, "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," Reprint, Washington, 1884, p. 25.

already been shown (page 36), it is impossible to determine with certainty in any case of supposed congenital deafness whether the deafness is really congenital or adventitious ; \* but it can generally be determined with certainty, if sufficiently thorough inquiry is made, whether the individual in question has or has not deaf relatives.

Let us now return to the marriages of the deaf in which one of the partners was a hearing person, and see how the liability to deaf offspring is affected by the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives by the hearing partner. The following table shows all the marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, in which one of the partners was a hearing person, classified according to the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives (not including descendants) by either partner, and the number and percentage of marriages of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

---

\* This consideration, aside from any other, is of itself sufficient to show the absurdity and folly of the attempts, happily unsuccessful, that have been made in one or two of our States to prohibit the marriage of the congenitally deaf by law. (See "An Act concerning crimes and punishments," which was introduced into the Connecticut legislature in 1895, was reported with approval by the Committee on Humane Institutions, and but for the strenuous efforts of Dr. Job Williams, Principal of the American School, at Hartford, for the Deaf, would have become a law. The text of the proposed act is given in "American Annals of the Deaf," Washington, 1895, vol. xl, p. 310. A similar law was proposed in the Minnesota legislature a few years ago.) If such a law were enacted it would be a dead letter, for it would be impossible to prove in any case that the deafness of the person accused of violating the law was congenital and not adventitious.

TABLE LXXIV.

One partner hearing, the other deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives. ....	32	10	31.250
Hearing partner had deaf relatives, deaf partner had not .. ..	20	1	5.000
Hearing partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf rela- tives of deaf partner reported. ....	11	2	18.182
Neither partner had deaf relatives. ....	56	3	5.357
Hearing partner had no deaf relatives, deaf partner had deaf relatives ....	22	2	9.091
Hearing partner had no deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf re- latives of deaf partner reported ...	3	1	33.333
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of hearing partner reported, deaf partner had deaf relatives. ...	168	29	17.262
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of hearing partner reported, deaf partner had no deaf relatives. ...	106	1	.943
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of either partner reported. ...	181	26	14.365
Total .....	599	75	12.521

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the several classes of marriage in which one of the partners was a hearing person and the other deaf:

TABLE LXXV.

One partner hearing ; the other deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners had deaf relatives .....	101	21	20.792
Hearing partner had deaf relatives, deaf partner had not . . . . .	43	2	4.651
Hearing partner had deaf relatives, no information concerning deaf relatives of deaf partner reported...	25	3	12.000
Neither partner had deaf relatives .....	167	4	2.395
Hearing partner had no deaf rela- tives, deaf partner had deaf rela- tives .....	75	8	10.666
Hearing partner had no deaf rela- tives, no information concerning deaf relatives of deaf partner re- ported . . . . .	7	1	14.285
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of hearing partner reported, deaf partner had deaf relatives .....	473	68	14.376
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of hearing partner reported, deaf partner had no deaf relatives	204	2	0.980
No information concerning deaf rela- tives of either partner reported .....	437	42	9.611
Total .. . . .	1,532	151	9.856

The total number of marriages shown in Tables LXXIV and LXXV, in which information concerning deaf relatives is reported, is unfortunately too small to enable us to form conclusions that are entirely satisfactory; but taking them for what they are worth, and comparing them class by class with Tables LXVI and LXVII, which relate to marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, it appears that hearing persons having deaf relatives are as liable to have deaf offspring as deaf persons having deaf relatives, supposing each to marry deaf partners who have, or each to marry deaf partners who have not, deaf relatives. Probably similar results would appear if we could obtain statistics of the marriages of hearing persons having deaf relatives and married to hearing part-



ners who have, or to hearing partners who have not, deaf relatives; but such marriages do not come within the scope of the present Inquiry. These statistics, so far as they go, corroborate the opinion expressed by the late Dr. H. P. Peet, that "the [hearing] brothers and sisters of a deaf-mute are about as liable to have deaf-mute children as the deaf-mute himself, supposing each to marry into families that have, or each into families that have not, shown a predisposition toward deaf-dumbness."\*

These statistics also corroborate the conclusion drawn by Dr. Bell (1) from the opinion of Dr. Peet above quoted, (2) from his own "personal observation that in the majority of cases where a deaf-mute was married to a hearing person, the hearing person belonged to a family containing deaf-mutes," and (3) from the results of marriages of former pupils of the Hartford and Illinois Schools: viz., that "in a large proportion of cases in which the marriages were productive of deaf offspring, both parents had deaf-mute relatives (even in the case where one parent was a hearing person)."

It is a natural deduction from the above conclusion of Dr. Bell's, and one that seems to be sustained by the statistics of Tables LXXIV. and LXXV., that the large proportion of deaf children born from marriages in which

---

\* H. P. PEET, "List of Pupils of the New York Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb," in "American Annals of the Deaf," Hartford, 1854, vol. vi, p. 235.

† A. G. BELL, "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," Reprint, Washington, 1884, pp. 24-26. Another conclusion of Dr. Bell's, drawn from the careful analysis he made of the marriages of former pupils of the Hartford and Illinois Schools, was that "in a large proportion of marriages where deaf offspring resulted both parents were probably congenitally deaf where both were deaf-mutes, and one parent congenitally deaf where only one was a deaf-mute." This conclusion is also corroborated by the present statistics, but, as Dr. Bell conjectured, and these statistics prove, the possession of deaf relatives is a more important indication of liability to deaf offspring than the mere fact of congenital deafness in one or both of the partners in marriage. In fact, it is the only trustworthy indication of such liability.

one of the partners was a hearing person and the other deaf, and both had deaf relatives, is to be explained by the hereditary transmission of certain physical conditions tending to produce deafness from the hearing partner as well as from the deaf partner.\* It also seems reasonable to conclude that in marriages where the hearing partner has deaf relatives and the deaf partner has not,† if the children are deaf, the hereditary transmission of the physical condition tending to produce deafness is due to the hearing partner rather than to the deaf partner.

But why is the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, larger in marriages where one of the partners was a hearing person than in those where both of the partners were deaf?‡ If the proportion of hearing partners with deaf relatives to the whole number of hearing partners were larger than the proportion of deaf partners with deaf relatives to the whole number of deaf partners, that circumstance, in connection with the explanation above suggested, might be accepted as the answer to this question; but a comparison of Tables XL and XLI with Tables

---

\* "An inherited characteristic \* \* \* may or may not have been manifested by the parents or other ancestors. If it is more common either among the ancestors or the brothers and sisters and cousins of the organism than it is in the race at large, this fact is scientific proof that it is an inherited characteristic" W. K. Brooks, in "The Possibility of the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," Washington, 1888, p. 1, reprinted in "Facts and Opinions relating to the Deaf from America," London, 1888, p. 99, in "Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb," etc., London, 1889, vol. II, p. 322, and in "Education of Deaf Children," Washington, 1892, Part II, p. 104.

† Only 20 such marriages were reported in the present statistics, and only one of these resulted in deaf offspring. It is probable, however, that there were some cases of this kind among the 11 marriages in which the hearing partner had deaf relatives and no information concerning deaf relatives of the deaf partner was reported, two of which resulted in deaf offspring, and among the 181 marriages in which no information concerning deaf relatives of either partner was reported, 26 of which resulted in deaf offspring.

‡ See Chapter II, pages 31-35.

XXXVI and XXXVII, respectively, shows a smaller proportion of hearing partners with deaf relatives to the whole number of hearing partners than of deaf partners with deaf relatives to the whole number of deaf partners. Possibly, though not probably, if the deaf relatives of the hearing partners were as fully reported as are those of the deaf partners, these proportions would be reversed. Possibly, on the other hand, though not probably, if the marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person were as numerous as those in which both of the partners were deaf, the disparity in the percentages of the results would be reversed. Taking the statistics as we have them, while the possession of deaf relatives by the hearing partner probably accounts for a considerable number of cases of deafness in the offspring, it does not alone seem to afford an adequate explanation of the fact that the percentage of deaf offspring is larger from marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person than from those in which both of the partners were deaf.

Another explanation, or partial explanation, of this phenomenon will be presented for consideration in the next chapter.

Returning now to the most important question of this whole Inquiry, Wherein lies the special liability of marriages of the deaf to result in deaf offspring? it appears from the facts above shown that the possession or non-possession of deaf relatives affords the key to its solution. If a deaf person, whether congenitally or adventitiously deaf, has deaf relatives, that person, however married, is liable to have deaf offspring, the liability being much greater, however, in the case of the congenitally deaf than in that of the adventitiously deaf; and if a deaf person, either with or without deaf relatives, marries a person, whether deaf or hearing, who has deaf relatives, the marriage is liable to result in deaf offspring. If both

partners have deaf relatives, the physical conditions tending to produce deafness, whatever they may be, are liable to be transmitted from both parents, and the probability of deaf offspring is therefore largely increased; but even when only one of the partners has deaf relatives, the liability to deaf offspring is still considerable.

In view of this conclusion, what advice is to be given the deaf on the subject of marriage? It may be said that it is of no use to give them any advice at all; that they do not want advice, and will resent it if offered. I do not think so. I have been intimately associated with the deaf for nearly half a century, and it is my observation and experience that, while they have confidence in their own judgment concerning matters with respect to which they know that they are competent to form an opinion, and while they resent any unwarranted interference with their liberty as individuals, they are always ready to listen to friendly advice from persons whom they believe to be their friends; and, especially with respect to the matter of marriage, I am persuaded by the earnest assurances I have received from many of them in the course of this Inquiry that they are exceedingly anxious to learn the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and, if possible, to avoid forming marriage ties which will be liable to result in deaf offspring.

It must be admitted, however, that the conclusion to which we have been brought renders the question of the advice to be given on the subject of marriage a delicate and difficult one. For those of the deaf who have no deaf relatives, indeed, the question is easily answered. The advice to be given them, if they wish to marry in such a way as not to be liable to deaf offspring, should not be, as it often has been, to choose hearing partners. It should be to choose partners, whether deaf or hearing, who have no deaf relatives; and the marriages for them to avoid, in order to escape deaf offspring, are not marriages with the deaf, but

marriages with persons, whether deaf or hearing, who have deaf relatives. But what advice shall be given the deaf, unhappily constituting a considerable proportion of the whole number, who have deaf relatives?

The answer to this question must depend upon the views one holds as to the rightfulness and propriety of marriage where the union is liable to result in deaf offspring. It may be said, with truth, that deaf persons having deaf relatives have as good right to marry as their hearing brothers and sisters, for a similar liability to deaf offspring probably exists in both cases; it may also be said, with truth, that they have a better right to marry than the consumptive, the inebriate, the criminal, or persons in whose families there exists a tendency to idiocy or insanity, for deafness is a less evil than is liable to be transmitted from individuals belonging to any of these classes; but whether, after all, it is right and advisable for them to marry is another question. Different answers to this question have been given by prominent friends of the deaf. Dr. Gillett, for nearly forty years Superintendent of the Illinois School for the Deaf, now President of the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf, says: "My advice to deaf-mutes is to contract marriage just as others do, with whomsoever they find that compatibility that ensures a happy marriage, as a truly felicitous union is not chiefly dependent upon physical conditions. \* \* \* One of their inalienable rights, as of others, is the pursuit of happiness; and I know of no better way of its pursuit than in a congenial conjugal relation."\* And in reply to an inquiry as to what his advice would be in an actual specified case, in which, from the numerous instances of deafness in the ancestry and other relationship of one of the persons contemplating marriage, and the congenital deafness of the other, the liability to

---

\* P. G. GILLETT, "Deaf-Mutes: Their Intermarriage and Offspring," in "Science," New York, 1891, vol. xvii, No. 417, p. 58.

deaf offspring appeared to be unusually great, he says : " My advice in such a case as this would be for the young people to examine themselves carefully as to what their motives are in contemplating matrimony. If they have no higher thought than the animal impulse, I would advise them by no means to enter into that sacred relation ; but if they are already so united in heart that each is needful to the happiness of the other, I would advise them, as soon as their circumstances are such as to enable them to maintain a family in comfort, whether the children should hear or be deaf, to follow the promptings of their higher nature, with a determination to rear their children to respectability and usefulness, which they can do in one case almost as effectually as in the other. \* \* \* If deafness were a crime, or a disgrace, or entailed suffering, I would certainly discourage it ; but since it does not, I deem it wise to encourage such a marriage, if the parties most interested believe, after reflection, that their own happiness will be promoted thereby.\*

On the other hand the President of Gallaudet College, who is recognized by all the deaf as a friend and well-wisher no less sincere, says : " If such a condition in the families was disclosed as to render the birth of deaf children probable, a reason for hesitation would surely be recognized which every truly benevolent and unselfish mind would regard as serious. I have several personal friends who have remained unmarried because of the existence in their families of certain mental or physical defects likely to descend to offspring ; and as I honor them for their unselfishness, so would I rank high in my esteem a deaf person who lived single for a similar reason. But the consideration of this aspect of the question need not be extended ; it can be dismissed with the advice to all young deaf people to look carefully into the matter of ' family

---

\* *Idem*, " Deaf-Mutes," in " Science," New York, 1890, vol. xvi, No. 404, p. 248.

deafness' before their hearts become entangled with any one, and govern themselves accordingly."\* My own opinion coincides with President Gallaudet's.

Whatever answer may be given to this difficult question, it cannot be doubted that all persons, whether deaf or hearing, who have deaf relatives, and all persons whom individuals belonging to this class may wish to marry, ought to be fully informed in due season of the fact that marriages of persons having deaf relatives are liable to result in deaf offspring.

---

\* E. M. GALLAUDET, "The Intermarriage of the Deaf, and their Education," in "Science," New York, 1890, vol. xvi, No. 408, p. 296

## CHAPTER V.

### CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES OF THE DEAF.

WHEN pupils are admitted to American schools for the deaf the question is usually asked whether their parents were related by blood, and from the replies to this question statistics have been collated showing a considerable percentage of deaf children born from consanguineous marriages in general;\* but, so far as I am aware, no attempt has hitherto been made to ascertain the results of consanguineous marriages of deaf persons. Indeed, the probable results of such marriages have scarcely been considered, except briefly by Dr. Bell in an Appendix to an Address on the subject of Marriage, delivered before the students of Gallaudet College a few years ago. In that connection Dr. Bell made the following statement of the results which in his opinion would be liable to follow consanguineous marriages of deaf persons:

“ 1. A deaf person, not born deaf, who has no deaf relatives, \* \* \* will probably not increase his liability to have deaf offspring by marrying a blood relative.

“ 2. A deaf person, born deaf, who has no deaf relatives, \* \* \* will probably increase his liability to have deaf offspring by marrying a blood relative.

“ 3. A deaf person, whether born deaf or not, who has deaf relatives, \* \* \* will probably increase his liability to have deaf offspring by marrying a blood relative, especially if that relative should happen to be on the deaf side of the family. For example: If his father has deaf relatives, and his mother has none, he will be more likely

---

\* See “School Statistics of the Deaf,” in “Proceedings of the World’s Congress of Instructors of the Deaf,” Washington, 1893, p. 276.



to have deaf offspring if he marries a relative of his father than if he marries a relative of his mother.”\*

In the present Inquiry an effort was made to obtain statistics of consanguineous marriages of the deaf, if any such marriages there were, by asking in the record blanks the questions, “ Were the parties related before marriage? If so, what relationship? ” Where the records were filled out by the partners in marriage themselves, or by persons who went directly to them for information, these questions were generally answered, but where, as in a majority of cases, they were filled out from school records, newspaper items, and other indirect sources, the questions were left unanswered. The following table shows all the marriages of the deaf, one or both of the partners being deaf, comprised in the records, and the number and percentage of them that were reported as consanguineous :

TABLE LXXVI.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number.	REPORTED AS CONSANGUINEOUS.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
One or both partners deaf .....	4, 471	31	0.693

Probably the actual number and percentage of consanguineous marriages of the deaf are larger than shown in the above table.

The following table shows the various relationships between the partners in marriage that were reported, and the percentage of each to the whole number of consanguineous marriages :

---

\* A. G. BELL, “ Marriage, An Address to the Deaf. Second Edition, with an Appendix upon Consanguineous Marriages,” Washington, 1891, p. 16.

TABLE LXXVII.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number.	Percent'e.
Partners first cousins .....	7	22.581
Partners second cousins.....	5	16.129
Partners third cousins .. ...	1	3.226
Partners cousins (degree unspecified)	14	45.161
Partners nephew and aunt.....	1	3.226
Partners distantly related.....	3	9.677
Total. ....	31	100.000

Whatever theory may be held as to the cause of the large percentage of deaf children born from consanguineous marriages in general—a subject that does not come within the scope of the present Inquiry,—we should expect from the facts presented in the last chapter, taken in connection with well-established laws of heredity, that consanguineous marriages in which the partners, one or both of them, were themselves deaf would be especially liable to result in deaf offspring; for the same physical condition tending to produce deafness would be likely to exist in both partners and, from the union of “like with like,” to be transmitted to their offspring with increased intensity. We should also expect the liability to deaf offspring to be greatest in the consanguineous marriages of the congenitally deaf and of those having other deaf relatives besides the other partner in marriage.

In comparing the results of the consanguineous marriages of the deaf and of the marriages not consanguineous, I shall pursue the same method as in the previous chapters, first regarding the marriages of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, and ascertaining what number and percentage of each class of marriage resulted in deaf offspring; and, secondly, regarding the children born from these marriages, and ascertaining what number and proportion of the children born from each class of marriage were deaf.

First, regarding the marriages, and classifying them with respect to the consanguinity of the partners in marriage, the following table shows the number of marriages of each class, of a year's standing or longer, of which the results have been reported, and the number and percentage of them resulting in deaf offspring (with or without other offspring):

TABLE LXXVIII

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Partners consanguineous . . . . .	31	14	45.161
Partners not consanguineous, or no information concerning consanguinity reported.....	3,047	286	9.386
Total . . . . .	3,078	300	9.746

Regarding next the children born from these marriages, the following table shows the number born from marriages reported as consanguineous, the number born from marriages not so reported, and the number and percentage of deaf children born from the marriages of each class :

TABLE LXXIX.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Partners consanguineous . . . . .	100	30	30.000
Partners not consanguineous, or no information concerning consanguinity reported... ..	6,682	558	8.351
Total . . . . .	6,782	588	8.670

Though the number of consanguineous marriages reported is small, it is, I think, large enough to give impor-

tance to the results. It appears from Table LXXVIII that the percentage of marriages reported as consanguineous that resulted in deaf offspring is nearly five times as great as that of marriages not so reported ; and it appears from Table LXXIX that the percentage of deaf children born from marriages reported as consanguineous is nearly four times as great as from marriages not so reported. We conclude that consanguineous marriages, one or both of the partners being deaf, are very liable to result in deaf offspring.

Let us now examine some of the classes into which the consanguineous marriages reported may be divided, though we must remember that where the totals are so small the results obtained cannot be regarded as conclusive.

The following table shows the several classes of relationship between the partners, the number and percentage of marriages of each class resulting in deaf offspring, and the number and percentage of deaf children born therefrom :

TABLE LXXX.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Partners first cousins .....	7	4	57.143
Partners second cousins.....	5	3	60.000
Partners third cousins ....	1	1	100.000
Partners cousins (degree unspecified).	14	3	21.429
Partners nephew and aunt. ....	1	1	100.000
Partners distantly related..	3	2	66.666
• Total .....	31	14	45.161

The following table shows the number of deaf children born from the marriages of each class and the number and percentage of them that were deaf :

TABLE LXXXI.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Partners first cousins.....	26	7	26.923
Partners second cousins. . . . .	25	10	40.000
Partners third cousins . . . . .	1	1	100.000
Partners cousins (degree unreported).	36	7	19.444
Partners nephew and aunt.....	4	3	75.000
Partners distantly related. . . . .	8	2	25.000
Total .....	100	30	30.000

The number of consanguineous marriages of each class of relationship, as shown in Tables LXXX and LXXXI, is too small to enable us to form conclusions as to their comparative results, but the large percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, in every one of the classes, indicates that it is dangerous for deaf persons to marry their blood relatives, no matter what the character or degree of the relationship.

The following table shows the marriages in which both of the partners were deaf, those in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person, and the number and percentage of marriages of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LXXXII.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners deaf . . . . .	12	5	41.666
One partner deaf, the other hearing.	18	9	50.000
One partner deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.....	1	.....	.....
Total .....	31	14	45.161

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the marriages of each class :

TABLE LXXXIII.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners deaf... ..	31	10	32.258
One partner deaf; the other hearing.	67	20	29.851
One partner deaf, the other unreported whether deaf or hearing.....	2	.....	.....
Total .....	100	30	30.000

It appears from Tables LXXXII and LXXXIII that the liability to deaf offspring is about the same in consanguineous marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other a hearing person, as in those in which both of the partners are deaf. The percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is somewhat larger in the former class, and the percentage of deaf children born therefrom is slightly larger in the latter class. However, the totals of the two classes are too small to yield conclusive results.

The following table shows the marriages in which the partners, one or both of them, were congenitally deaf, those in which neither of the partners was congenitally deaf, and the number and percentage of marriages of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LXXXIV.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
One or both partners congenitally deaf	17	7	41.176
Neither partner congenitally deaf .....	14	7	50.000
Total ....	31	14	45.161

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the marriages of each class :

TABLE LXXXV.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number of children	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number	Percent'e.
One or both partners congenitally deaf	64	16	25.000
Neither partner congenitally deaf .....	36	14	38.889
Total .....	100	30	30.000

It appears from Tables LXXXIV and LXXXV that consanguineous marriages of the deaf are more liable to result in deaf offspring where neither of the partners is congenitally deaf than where congenital deafness exists in one or both of the partners. This is entirely contrary to what we should expect, judging from the results of the marriages of the congenitally deaf in general as shown in Chapter III. The totals, however, of the two classes of consanguineous marriages under consideration are so small that the result of the comparison of their percentages is not to be accepted as conclusive. The only conclusion we can draw is that it is dangerous for a deaf person, whether congenitally or adventitiously deaf, to marry a blood relative.

The following table shows the marriages in which one or both of the partners had other deaf relatives besides the other partner, those in which neither of the partners had other deaf relatives (not including descendants), and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring :

TABLE LXXXVI.

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf	Number of marriages.	MARRIAGES RESULTING IN DEAF OFFSPRING.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
One or both partners had other deaf relatives besides the other partner	23	11	47.826
Neither partner had other deaf relatives besides the other partner . .	8	3	37.500
Total .	31	14	45.161

The following table shows the number of children, and the number and percentage of deaf children, born from the marriages of each class .

TABLE LXXXVII

Consanguineous marriages of the deaf.	Number of children.	DEAF CHILDREN.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
One or both partners had other deaf relatives besides the other partner .	78	22	28.205
Neither partner had other deaf relatives besides the other partner . . .	22	8	36.364
Total	100	30	30.000

It appears from Table LXXXVI that in consanguineous marriages of the deaf the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is larger where one or both of the partners in marriage had other deaf relatives besides the other partner than where neither of the partners had other deaf relatives besides the other partner. This was to be expected, judging from the results of the marriages of the deaf in general who have deaf relatives, as shown in Chapter IV, but the difference in the two percentages is not as great as might have been expected. On the other hand, contrary to expectation, Table LXXXVII shows a larger percentage of deaf children born from marriages where



neither of the partners had other deaf relatives besides the other partner. While the totals of the two classes, especially of the latter class, are too small to render the results of the comparison conclusive, they indicate unmistakably that it is dangerous for a deaf person to marry a blood relative, whether there are other deaf relatives in the family or not.

The conclusion to be drawn from the results of consanguineous marriages, as shown in Tables LXXVIII to LXXXVII, is that under all circumstances it is exceedingly dangerous for a deaf person to marry a blood relative, no matter whether the relative is deaf or hearing, nor whether the deafness of either or both or neither of the partners is congenital, nor whether either or both or neither have other deaf relatives besides the other partner.

Let us now return, once more, to the perplexing question which has been constantly recurring in the course of this Inquiry, and for which, in Chapter IV, we found but a partial solution. Why is the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, larger in marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person than in those in which both of the partners were deaf?

If we turn back to Table LXXXII we shall see that in one respect it presents a remarkable contrast with all the previous tables dealing with marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person. In all the previous tables the marriages of this class, as compared with those in which both of the partners were deaf, are few in number, but in this table of consanguineous marriages they constitute a majority of the marriages reported. A comparative table will illustrate this difference.

The following table shows the number of marriages reported in the records in which both of the partners were deaf, the number in which one of them was deaf and the other a hearing person, and the number and percentage of consanguineous marriages reported in each class :

TABLE LXXXVIII

Marriages of the deaf	Number of marriages.	CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners deaf ..... .	3,242	12	0.370
One partner deaf, the other hearing .	894	18	2.013
One partner deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing .....	335	1	0.298
Total .....	4,471	31	0.693

As has already been said, it is probable that the consanguineous marriages are not fully reported ; but there is no reason to suppose that there was any intentional suppression of the facts, or that the consanguineous marriages are more fully reported where one of the partners was a hearing person than where both of them were deaf.

I have no explanation to offer of the remarkable contrast in percentages shown in Table LXXXVIII ; but I think we may derive an explanation from it, to supplement and complete the partial explanation already given, of the large proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, in marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person.

It has been shown in the present chapter that consanguineous marriages of the deaf, one or both of the partners being deaf, are far more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages of the deaf. It appears from Table LXXXVIII that the percentage of consanguineous marriages is nearly six times as large among the marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person as among those in which both of the partners were deaf. Do not these two facts, taken together, explain, to a considerable extent at least, the large proportion of marriages resulting in deaf children, and of deaf children

born therefrom, where one of the partners was a hearing person? True, the number of marriages of this class reported as consanguineous, that resulted in deaf offspring, as shown in Table LXXXII, is only 9; but these 9 marriages constitute 12 per cent. of the total 75 marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person that resulted in deaf offspring,\* and the 20 deaf children who, as was shown in Table LXXXIII, were born from consanguineous marriages of this class constitute 13.2 per cent. of the total 151 deaf children born from marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person.† On the other hand, if we examine the 220 marriages resulting in deaf offspring in which both of the partners were deaf,\* we find that only 5, or 2.3 per cent., of them are reported as consanguineous, and that the 10 deaf children born from these consanguineous marriages constitute only 2.3 per cent. of the total 429 deaf children born from marriages of that class.‡ Moreover, there are 55, or 73.3 per cent., of the 75 marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person that resulted in deaf offspring, with respect to which the question whether the partners were related before marriage is not answered in the marriage records; if, as seems not improbable, some of these marriages were also consanguineous, still other cases of deaf offspring are accounted for. On the whole, we may conclude that the large proportion of consanguineous marriages among the marriages in which one of the partners was a hearing person is one of the reasons, and perhaps the principal reason, that in marriages of this class the percentage resulting in deaf offspring, and the percentage of deaf children born, are so large.

To the advice to be given the deaf on the subject of marriage must be added, with especial emphasis, the advice under no circumstances whatever to marry persons who are related to them in any degree of consanguinity.

---

\* See Table X

---

† See Table XI.

## CHAPTER VI.

### HAPPINESS.

THE fourth and last question proposed for consideration in the present Inquiry is this: Aside from the question of the liability of the offspring to deafness, are marriages in which both of the partners are deaf more likely to result happily than marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person?

When Dr. Bell testified before the "Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb," etc., in London a few years ago, in reply to a similar question, he said: "The opinions of the principals [of American Schools for the Deaf] seem to be that they are happier when both are deaf-mutes. But I know of no data myself from which we can form conclusions."\*

The opinion to which Dr. Bell refers has been forcibly expressed by Dr. Gillett, who has a personal acquaintance with more than two thousand deaf people, many of whom are married: "I believe," he says, "that, as a general rule, their intermarriage is more congenial, and productive of more happiness, than the marriage of deaf with hearing persons, though I have known most beautiful and happy unions of the latter kind. 'Be ye not unequally yoked together' is a Scripture injunction that bears with as much force upon the deaf as upon any others."† This opinion is also held by the majority of the deaf themselves.

---

\* A. G. BELL, in "Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb," etc., London, 1889, Answer to Question No. 21,557, Vol. III, p. 825. Reprinted in "Education of Deaf Children," Washington, 1892, Part II, p. 24.

† P. G. GILLETT, "Deaf-Mutes," in "Science," New York, 1890, vol. xvi, No. 404, p. 248.

On the other hand, President Gallaudet, whose acquaintance with the deaf is also wide and intimate, in referring to Dr. Gillett's opinion above quoted, says : " Many deaf-mutes think more happiness is to be found in a marriage with a deaf person than with one who hears ; but this is by no means as certain as Dr. Gillett, or the deaf themselves, suppose, for it involves a question that has not yet been settled, and never may be. I have known some intermarriages of the deaf to result in wretched unhappiness, but I do not for that reason conclude that such marriages must always, or even often, be unhappy. It is undoubtedly true that some marriages of deaf people with those who hear have turned out badly, but Dr. Gillett's admission that he has known ' most beautiful and happy unions of this kind ' is a sufficient answer to all objection to such unions ; and to his admission I may be permitted to add the testimony from experience, of both a son and a brother, that marriage between the deaf and the hearing may be entirely happy and essentially successful."\* And Dr. Bell, addressing the students of Gallaudet College on the subject of Marriage, says : " Do not let any one place in your minds the idea that such a marriage [with a hearing person] cannot be a happy one. The chances are infinitely in your favor that out of the millions of hearing persons in this country you may be able to find one with whom you may be happy than that you should find one among the smaller numbers of the deaf."†

As President Gallaudet says, the question is one that has not yet been settled. It cannot be settled by such individual testimony and opinion as have hitherto constituted the only attempts in this direction. All of us who

---

\* E. M. GALLAUDET, "The Intermarriage of the Deaf," in "Science," New York, 1890, vol. xvi, No. 408, p. 296

† A. G. BELL, "Marriage An Address to the Deaf," Washington, 1891, p. 12.

are familiar with the deaf can recall many happy marriages, and some unhappy marriages, of each of the two classes, just as we can recall many happy marriages and some unhappy ones among hearing people. Our opinions as to whether the proportion is greater or less in one class than in the other are apt to be influenced by our personal acquaintance, and our personal acquaintance is generally too limited to render our opinions conclusive.

In the original plan of the present Inquiry no provision was made for obtaining information concerning the happiness or unhappiness of marriages of the deaf, for this did not seem to be a subject to which statistics were applicable. But after the returns began to come in, noticing that on the page devoted to "Remarks" divorces and separations were sometimes recorded, it occurred to me that these might afford a basis for a comparison of the unhappiness of the two classes of marriage and, *per contra*, of their happiness. Statistics of divorce and separation, it is true, do not indicate the entire amount of unhappiness in marriage. "They simply determine the number of cases in which the marital infelicity is so burdensome that the parties are willing to bear publicity of their most intimate relations rather than longer endure the burdens of unhappy conditions."\* But they indicate the amount of unhappiness in the one class of marriages of the deaf as fully as in the other, and so enable us to determine the relative proportion of unhappiness in the two classes. I have therefore taken note of all cases of divorce or separation reported in the marriage records, and have added all others of which I have been able to obtain trustworthy information from newspaper publications and personal correspondence. In the following tables the marriages are classified according to whether both of the partners

---

\* C. D. WRIGHT, "A Report on Marriage and Divorce in the United States, 1867 to 1886, including an Appendix relating to Marriage and Divorce in certain countries in Europe," Washington, 1891, p 163

in marriage were deaf, or one of them was deaf and the other a hearing person. In the first table the number and percentage of divorces in each class are shown :

TABLE LXXXIX.

Marriages of the deaf	Number of marriages.	DIVORCES.	
		Number.	Percent'e.
Both partners deaf. . . . .	3,242	33	1.018
One partner deaf, the other hearing .	894	25	2.796
One partner deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing. . .	335	7	2.090
	4,471	65	1.454

The following table shows the number and percentage of separations in each class .

TABLE XC.

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages.	SEPARATIONS.	
		Number	Percent'e.
Both partners deaf . . . . .	3,242	51	1.573
One partner deaf, the other hearing.	894	33	3.691
One partner deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing . . .	335		2.090
	4,471	91	2.035

Combining Tables LXXXIX and XC, we have .

TABLE XCI

Marriages of the deaf.	Number of marriages	DIVORCES AND SEPARATIONS.	
		Number.	Percent'e
Both partners deaf . . . . .	3,242	84	2.591
One partner deaf, the other hearing	894	58	6.488
One partner deaf, the other unre- ported whether deaf or hearing . .	335	14	4.179
	4,471	156	3.489

It appears from Tables LXXXIX, XC, and XCI that the percentage of divorces and separations is far less in marriages in which both of the partners were deaf than in marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person. We conclude that in marriages of the former class, as a rule, and other things being equal, the probability of happiness is greater than in those of the latter class. The fourth question of our Inquiry, then, must be answered in the affirmative: Marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are more likely to result happily than those in which one of the partners is deaf and the other a hearing person.

There are three obvious reasons why this should be so.

1. Where both husband and wife are deaf they are united by the strong bond of mutual fellowship and sympathy growing out of their similar condition, which has already been mentioned as the principal reason why the deaf generally prefer to marry one another rather than hearing persons.\*
2. They are able to communicate with each other with perfect ease and freedom.
3. The most intimate social relations and sympathies of both, outside the domestic circle, are with the same class of persons. In marriages in which one of the partners is deaf and the other a hearing person, the first of these ties is always lacking, and the second and third are often lacking to a greater or less extent. Even under these less favorable conditions the mutual love of husband and wife may be, and often is, strong enough to render the union a very happy one; but, other things being equal, the greater probability of happiness for marriages in which both of the partners are deaf, indicated by the above statistics of divorce and separation, seems to be indicated also by the nature of the case.

\* See Chapter II, pages 23-29.



## CHAPTER VII.

### SUMMARY OF STATISTICS AND CONCLUSIONS

THE most important of the statistics presented in the preceding chapters, and of the conclusions drawn from them, may be summed up as follows .

#### AMERICA AND EUROPE.

Marriages of the deaf are more common in America than in Europe. The former pupils of American Schools for the Deaf here recorded as married constitute 23.1 per cent. of the whole number who attended school up to the year 1890, and the actual percentage of the married deaf in America is probably much higher than that. In the countries of Europe from which we have statistics it is only in Denmark that the proportion rises as high as 23 per cent. ; in the other countries it varies from 12 to 7 per cent.\* This more frequent marriage of deaf persons in America is probably partly due to the absence of certain restrictions that hamper marriage more or less in most European countries, and partly to the more prosperous circumstances, and consequent greater ability to support a family, of the deaf of this country.

#### THE PRESENT CENTURY.

The marriages of deaf persons in America have increased at a high rate of progression during the present century. The proportion of the marriages recorded for the first decade to the whole number of marriages during the century is 0.02 per cent. For the third decade it is 0.18 per cent., and in each subsequent decade it increases

---

\* See Introduction, pp. 5-6.

until in the ninth decade it is 22.7 per cent.\* Making due allowance for the increase in population, and for the fact that the marriages of the later decades are probably more fully recorded than the earlier ones, the high rate of progression indicated is doubtless largely due to the establishment of schools for the deaf. Not only do the opportunities for acquaintance afforded by school life tend to promote marriage, but the effect of education is to bring the deaf into closer relations with society and to increase their ability to marry and support a family.

#### DEAF AND HEARING PARTNERS.

A large majority of the married deaf have married deaf rather than hearing partners, the proportion of marriages in which both partners were deaf being 72.5 per cent., and of those in which one of the partners was deaf and the other a hearing person 20 per cent.† This preference of the deaf for one another as partners in marriage has been ascribed to their environment during education, which brings them together in boarding-schools and fosters the use of the sign-language. No doubt this environment has had some influence in promoting their marriage with one another; but that it is not the chief cause is shown by the fact that 77 per cent. of the deaf here recorded who attended day-schools, 78 per cent. of those who attended exclusively oral schools, and 62 per cent. of those who attended no school for the deaf, married deaf partners.‡ The chief cause that leads deaf people to marry one another rather than hearing persons, and one that affects those who have been educated in day and oral schools, and even those who have attended

---

\* See Table I. In the tables of the preceding chapters the percentages are carried out to the third figure of decimals, in this Summary they are generally given with less precision.

† See Table V.

‡ See Tables VI and VII.

no school for the deaf, in only a little less degree than those who have been segregated for the purposes of education and have attended schools not exclusively oral, is the deep feeling of fellowship and sympathy which has its roots in the similarity of condition of all the deaf, under whatever circumstances and by whatever method they have been educated.

#### PRODUCTIVENESS.

Marriages of deaf persons, one or both of the partners being deaf (taken as a whole, without regard to the character of the deafness), are probably somewhat, but not very much, less productive than ordinary marriages. The proportion of marriages of the deaf without offspring is 14.1 per cent., and the average number of children to each mother who had children is 2.61. In Massachusetts in 1885, the proportion of women without offspring was 17.56 per cent., and the average number of children to each mother who had had children was 4.11.\* The actual difference in the average number of children to a mother is doubtless less than these figures would indicate, as the children of the deaf are probably not fully reported and a considerable proportion of their marriages are of recent date.

Marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are somewhat less productive than those in which one of the partners is deaf and the other a hearing person. The proportion of marriages of the former class without offspring is 15 per cent., and the average number of children to each marriage resulting in offspring is 2.5; in the latter class the proportion without offspring is 11 per cent., and the average number of children to each marriage is 2.9.†

Between marriages of the congenitally deaf and those of the adventitiously deaf, there is not much difference in

---

\* See Chapter I, p. 17

† See Tables VIII and IX.

productiveness, but the former are probably slightly less productive. In marriages of the former class, one or both of the partners being congenitally deaf, the proportion without offspring is 15.5 per cent., and the average number of children to each marriage resulting in offspring is 2.72; in marriages of the latter class, one or both of the partners being adventitiously deaf, the proportion without offspring is 14 per cent., and the average number of children to each marriage is 2.47.\* The less number of children from marriages of the adventitiously deaf is perhaps due to the fact that the average duration of the marriages of this class recorded was probably less than that of the marriages of the congenitally deaf, as a majority of the earlier pupils of American schools were congenitally deaf, while within recent years a majority of the pupils have been adventitiously deaf.

#### DEAF OFFSPRING.

##### *(a) One or Both Partners Deaf.*

Marriages of deaf persons, one or both of the partners being deaf (taken as a whole, without regard to the character of the deafness), are far more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages. The proportion of marriages of deaf persons resulting in deaf offspring is 9.7 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 8.6 per cent.† Just what proportion of ordinary marriages result in deaf offspring, and what proportion of deaf children are born therefrom, we do not know, but they are probably less than one-tenth of one per cent.

On the other hand, marriages of the deaf are far more likely to result in hearing offspring than in deaf offspring, the proportion of hearing children reported being 75 per cent. and the actual proportion probably considerably higher, while that of deaf children, as above stated, is 8.6 per cent.‡

---

\* See Tables XX and XXII.    † See Tables III and IV.    ‡ See Table IV.

These results are in accordance, on the one hand, with the law of heredity that a physical anomaly or an unusual liability to certain diseases existing in the parent tends to be transmitted to the offspring, and, on the other hand, with the law of heredity that the offspring tend to revert to the normal type.

*(b) Both Partners Deaf, or One Partner Hearing.*

For the hereditary transmission of the physical condition that results in deafness, it is not necessary that both of the partners in marriage should be deaf. On the contrary, taking the deaf as a whole, without regard to the character of the deafness, marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are not more liable to result in deaf offspring than those in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person. Indeed, they seem to be less liable to result in deaf offspring. The proportion of marriages in which both of the partners were deaf that resulted in deaf offspring is 9.2 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 8.4 per cent.; the proportion of marriages in which one of the partners was deaf and the other was a hearing person, that resulted in deaf offspring, is 12.5 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 9.8 per cent.\* If, instead of the number of marriages, we regard the number of deaf married persons, the number of deaf children born to every 100 deaf persons married to deaf partners is 9.4, while the number born to every 100 deaf persons married to hearing partners is 25.8.† Even in marriages where both of the partners were congenitally deaf, the large proportion of them resulting in deaf offspring (24.7 per cent.) and of deaf children born therefrom (25.9 per cent.)‡ can be explained in most cases by the circumstance that there were two persons instead of one liable

---

\* See Tables X and XI    † See Table XII    ‡ See Tables XXIII and XXIV.

to transmit the physical condition that results in deafness; for, if we regard the number of congenitally deaf married persons, we find that the number of deaf children born to every 100 congenitally deaf persons married to congenitally deaf partners (30.8) is not greater than the number born to every 100 congenitally deaf persons married to hearing partners (34.2).\* In the majority of cases no intensification of the liability to deaf offspring seems to be caused by the union of two deaf persons.

This conclusion is not, as it might appear at first sight, inconsistent with the general law of heredity that the liability to the hereditary transmission of any characteristic existing in the parent is increased by the union of "like with like;" for, when the deafness of the parent reappears in the offspring, the characteristic transmitted is not deafness, as has been generally assumed by writers who have discussed this subject, but it is some anomaly of the auditory organs or of the nervous system, or the tendency to some disease, of which deafness is but the result or the symptom. Inasmuch as these anomalies and diseases resulting in deafness are many and various, it is probable that in most marriages of deaf persons, and even of congenitally deaf persons, the pathological condition that results in deafness is not the same in one partner that it is in the other, and their marriage therefore is not, from a physiological point of view, a union of "like with like."

On the other hand, where the pathological condition of the two partners is the same, as it probably is in the majority of consanguineous marriages of deaf persons, there is doubtless an intensification of the liability to deaf offspring; but happily such marriages are comparatively rare. The number of them here reported, probably less than the actual number, is 31, which is 0.69 per cent. of the whole number of marriages.† The proportion of these 31 marriages that resulted in deaf offspring is 45 per cent.,

---

\* See Table XXXIII.

† See Table LXXVI.

and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 30 per cent.\* The curious circumstance above noted that the percentages of marriages resulting in deaf offspring and of deaf children born therefrom are larger where one of the partners was a hearing person than where both of them were deaf is probably chiefly due to the fact that the proportion of consanguineous marriages reported was much greater where one of the partners was a hearing person (2 per cent.) than where both of them were deaf (0.37 per cent.).†

*(c) Partners Congenitally or Adventitiously Deaf.*

Congenitally deaf persons, whether they are married to one another, to adventitiously deaf, or to hearing partners, are far more liable to have deaf offspring than are adventitiously deaf persons. The proportion of marriages of the former class, one or both of the partners being congenitally deaf, resulting in deaf offspring, is 13 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 12 per cent.; in marriages of the latter class, one or both of the partners being adventitiously deaf, the proportion resulting in deaf offspring is 5.6 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 4.2 per cent.‡ The liability to deaf offspring is greatest when both of the partners are congenitally deaf, the proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring in such cases being 24.7 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom 25.9 per cent.¶

Marriages of adventitiously deaf persons are more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages, but when both of the partners are adventitiously deaf or one of them is a hearing person the liability is slight. The proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring where both

\* See Tables LXXX and LXXXI. † See Tables XXIX and XXX.

‡ See Table LXXXVIII.

¶ See Tables XXV and XXVI.

partners were adventitiously deaf is 3.5 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 2.3 per cent. Where adventitiously deaf persons were married to hearing partners the proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is 3.2 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 2.2 per cent. Where they were married to congenitally deaf partners the proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is 8 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 6.5 per cent.\*

The greater liability to deaf offspring of marriages of the congenitally deaf than of the adventitiously deaf is in accordance with the generally accepted law of heredity that congenital or innate characteristics are far more likely to be transmitted to the offspring than acquired characteristics. When the deafness of adventitiously deaf parents does reappear in the offspring, we may suppose that the physical anomaly or tendency to disease of which deafness was the result was probably congenital in the parent though actual deafness did not appear until some period later in life.

*(d) Partners Having Deaf Relatives.*

Deaf persons having deaf relatives, however they are married, and hearing persons having deaf relatives and married to deaf partners, are very liable to have deaf offspring. (Probably hearing persons having deaf relatives and married to hearing partners are subject to the same liability, but such cases do not come within the scope of the present Inquiry.) However the marriages of the deaf are classified with respect to the deafness or hearing of one or both of the partners, or with respect to the congenital or adventitious character of the deafness, the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring and the percentage of deaf children born therefrom are almost in-

---

\* See Tables XXVII and XXVIII.



variably highest where both of the partners had deaf relatives, next highest where one of them had deaf relatives and the other had not, and least where neither had deaf relatives; the only exceptions being in a few classes where the totals are too small to be regarded as important.\* Taking all the marriages of a year's standing or longer of which the results have been reported, where both of the partners had deaf relatives the proportion of them resulting in deaf offspring is 23.5 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 20.9 per cent.; where one of the partners had deaf relatives and the other had not, the proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is 6.6 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 6.4 per cent.; where neither of them had deaf relatives the proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is only 2.3 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom 1.2 per cent.† Probably the actual percentages of marriages resulting in deaf offspring and of deaf children born therefrom, where neither of the partners had deaf offspring, are even less than these, for in some cases the statements of the marriage records that neither of the partners had deaf relatives are not well authenticated, and in all of them there is the possibility that there were deaf relatives unknown to the persons who filled out the record blanks. Where neither of the partners has deaf relatives the liability to deaf offspring is very slight, perhaps not greater than in ordinary marriages.

In marriages where both of the partners are congenitally deaf and both have deaf relatives the proportion of them having deaf offspring and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom are very high (28.4 and 30.3 per cent.);‡ but where neither of the partners has deaf relatives, even though both of them are congenitally deaf, the

---

\* See Tables XLII to LXXI, inclusive.

† See Tables LXXII and LXXIII.

‡ See Tables XLII and XLIII.

liability seems to be slight, perhaps not greater than in ordinary marriages. Fourteen marriages of this class are reported, resulting in 24 children.\* Of these children one was deaf, but in this case the statement of the marriage record that neither of the partners had deaf relatives is not well authenticated.† If we accept the statement, the proportion of marriages of this class resulting in deaf offspring is 7.1 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 4.1 per cent.‡ but if we reject it, there remains not a single instance of marriages in which both of the partners were congenitally deaf, and neither had deaf relatives, that resulted in deaf offspring. Though the total number of marriages of this class is not large enough to render the result conclusive, yet, taking them in connection with the 111 other marriages of congenitally deaf persons in which neither of the partners had deaf relatives,‡ we are justified in concluding that, while congenital deafness may be a *prima facie* indication of a liability to deaf offspring, it is not to be accepted as a conclusive evidence of such liability.

The possession of deaf relatives, on the other hand, seems to be a trustworthy indication of a liability to deaf offspring. If a deaf person, whether congenitally or adventitiously deaf, has deaf relatives, that person, however married, is liable to have deaf offspring, the liability being much greater, however, in the case of the congenitally deaf than in that of the adventitiously deaf; and if a deaf person, either with or without deaf relatives, marries a person, whether deaf or hearing, who has deaf relatives,

---

\* See Tables XLII and XLIII †See Chapter IV, p. 72.

‡See Tables XLIV to LI, inclusive The proportion of these 111 marriages that resulted in deaf offspring is 4.5 per cent and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 2.4 per cent., or, if we eliminate one marriage record, the statement of which that neither partner had deaf relatives is not well authenticated, the proportion of marriages resulting in deaf offspring is 3.6 per cent., and the proportion of deaf children born therefrom is 2 per cent.

the marriage is liable to result in deaf offspring. If both partners have deaf relatives, the physical conditions tending to produce deafness, whatever they may be, are liable to be transmitted from both parents, and the probability of deaf offspring is therefore largely increased; but even when only one of the partners has deaf relatives, the liability to deaf offspring is still considerable.

(e) *Partners Consanguineous.*

The marriages of the deaf most liable to result in deaf offspring are those in which the partners are related by consanguinity. Thirty-one such marriages are reported in the marriage records, and of these 14, or 45.1 per cent., resulted in deaf offspring. One hundred children were born from these 31 marriages, and of these 30, or 30 per cent., were deaf.\*

The totals of the several classes of relationship, as first cousins, second cousins, etc., and the totals of the several classes of marriage, as of both of the partners deaf, one of the partners deaf and the other hearing, one or both of the partners congenitally or adventitiously deaf, one or both of the partners having other deaf relatives or not, are too small to enable us to form conclusions as to their comparative results; but the large percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring, and of deaf children born therefrom, in every one of these classes, indicates that it is exceedingly dangerous for a deaf person to marry a blood relative, no matter what the character or degree of the relationship may be, and no matter whether the relative is deaf or hearing, nor whether the deafness of either or both or neither of the partners is congenital, nor whether either or both or neither of them have other deaf relatives.†

---

\* See Tables LXXVIII and LXXIX.

† See Tables LXXX to LXXXVII, inclusive.

The reason why consanguineous marriages are so much more liable to result in deaf offspring than ordinary marriages of the deaf is, probably, that in such marriages the same condition tending to produce deafness is likely to exist in both of the partners, and, from the union of "like with like," to be transmitted to their offspring with increased intensity.

*(f) Summary of Statistics.*

The most important of the statistics relating to the several classes of marriages of the deaf, showing the number of marriages of each class of which the results were reported and the number and percentage of each class resulting in deaf offspring, also the number of children born from the marriages of each class, and the number and percentage of them that were deaf, are summed up in the following table.

The fifth and sixth columns of this table, giving the percentage of marriages resulting in deaf offspring and the percentage of deaf children born therefrom, indicate at a glance the comparative liability to deaf offspring of the several classes of marriage. The extremes of liability are found in the two classes last named in the table.

TABLE XCII.

Marriages of the deaf	NUMBER OF MARRIAGES.		NUMBER OF		PER-	
	resulting in de offspring		offspring		Deaf	
One or both partners deaf	3,078	300	6,782	588	9.7	8.6
Both partners deaf . . . . .	2,377	220	5,072	429	9.2	8.4
One partner deaf, the other hearing	599	75	1,532	151	2.5	9.8
One or both partners congenitally deaf	1,477	194	3,401	413	3.1	12.1
One or both partners adventitiously deaf	2,212	124	4,701	199	5.6	4.2
Both partners congenitally deaf . . .	335	83	779	202	24	25.9
One partner congenitally deaf, the other adventitiously deaf . . . . .	814	66	1,820	119	8.1	6.5
Both partners adventitiously deaf . . .	345	30	1,720		3.5	2.3
One partner congenitally deaf, the other hearing . . . . .	191		528		4.6	11.9
One partner adventitiously deaf, the other hearing . . . . .	310		713		3.	2.2
Both partners had deaf relatives . . .	437		1,060	222	23.5	20.9
One partner had deaf relatives, the other had not . . . . .	541		1,210		6.6	6.4
Neither partner had deaf relatives	471		1,044		2.3	1.2
Both partners congenitally deaf, both had deaf relatives . . . . .	172		429	130	8.4	30.3
Both partners congenitally deaf, one had deaf relatives, the other had not	49		105		16.3	20.0
Both partners congenitally deaf neither had deaf relatives . . . . .	14		24		7.1	4.1
Both partners adventitiously deaf, both had deaf relatives . . . . .	5		114		17.5	9.6
Both partners adventitiously deaf, one had deaf relatives, the other had not	167		357		4.1	2.8
Both partners adventitiously deaf neither had deaf relatives . . . . .	284		550		0.7	0.3
Partners consanguineous.	3		100		45.1	30.0

## HAPPINESS.

Marriages in which both of the partners are deaf are more likely, other things being equal, to result happily than those in which one of the partners is deaf and the other is a hearing person. The proportion of divorces and separations reported in the marriage records where both of the partners were deaf is 2.5 per cent.; where one of the partners was deaf and the other was a hearing person the proportion reported is 6.4 per cent.\*

The more favorable conditions for happiness where both of the partners are deaf, other things being equal, are, doubtless, the strong bond of mutual fellowship growing out of their similar condition, the ease and freedom with which they communicate with each other, and the identity of their social relations and sympathies outside of the domestic circle.

\* See Table XCI.



## APPENDIX A.

### TABULAR STATEMENT OF MARRIAGES.

The following pages present in tabular form the most important of the details contained in the marriage records upon which this Inquiry is based.

In the column headed "Partners in Marriage," the word "Husband" or "Wife" printed in roman type indicates a deaf person; in *italics*, a hearing person; in **heavy-faced type**, unreported whether deaf or hearing.

In the columns headed "Number of Children," "Brothers and Sisters," and "Deaf Relatives," the dash (—) indicates that there were no persons of the class named; the dotted line ( . . . ) that I have no information concerning the existence of such persons. The abbreviation "sev." stands for "several."

The heading "Unknown" means "Unknown whether deaf or hearing."

In the columns headed "Deaf Relatives" and "Remarks" the numbers refer to the "Reference numbers" of the marriages as they are recorded in this Tabular Statement.

"Age of deafness" means "Age at which deafness occurred." The age is given in years or fractions of a year. The abbreviation "Inf." means "Infancy;" "B" means "Born deaf," and the dotted line here, as elsewhere throughout the Tabular Statement, indicates absence of information.

In the column headed "School for the deaf where educated," the abbreviation of the name of a State indicates a State school for the deaf. Other schools are indicated by the most prominent words in their titles or by the names of the towns where they are situated. The abbreviation "Coll." stands for "Gallaudet College;" "H. M." for "Horace Mann School;" and the letters "C," "N," and "W," prefixed to the initials of a State, for "Central," "Northern," and "Western." The dash indicates that the person did not attend any school for the deaf; the dotted line, absence of information.



Reference number	MARRIAGES.				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.							
	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No. of Children.				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown	
1	1893		2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1860	6 8	2 1	4 7	—	.....
2	1889		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1850	6 7	2 2	4 5	—	.....
3	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1850	9 5	3 4	6 1	—	Cousin .....
4	1893		5	2	3	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1847	7 7	2 1	5 6	—	.....
5	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1857	7 6	2 1	5 5	—	Nephew and niece, ..
6	1890 1888		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1862	11 4	1 1	10 3	—	.....
7	1890 1867		6	6	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1842	14 3	7 3	7 —	—	3 nephews Parents (No 2421), uncle (Husb
8	1891 1880		4	—	3	1	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1854	4 8	1 1	3 7	—	.....
9	1892 1863		4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1836	8 6	1 3	7 3	—	.....
10	1892 1888		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1864	8 2	1 1	7 1	—	.....
11	1889 1882		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1842	1 1	1 1	— —	—	2 second cousins, ....
12	1890 1864		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1842	5 6	3 1	2 5	—	Niece (daughter of a hearing b
13	1890 1873		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1845	1 5	1 2	3 3	—	Mother (Wife No 93) ..... Second cousin
14	1889		5	3	2	—	{ Husband 1807 Wife 1821	3 3	3 —	— —	—	.....
15	1890 1886		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1856	4 6	1 1	3 5	—	2 cousins ..
16	1891 1866		2	1	1	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1844	1 5	1 2	3 3	—	Aunt and cousin .....
17	1892 1884		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1860	12 2	1 1	11 1	—	Cousin ..
18	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1857 Wife ..	1 —	1 —	— —	—	.....
19	1890 1884		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1861	5 4	— 3	5 1	—	Father (Husb. No 257); aunt 2431); aunt; niece; 2 gra 2 cousins (Wife No. 3100 No. 2541)
20	1890 1880		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife ..	3 —	1 —	2 —	—	.....
21	1890 1888		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife .. 1856	7 5	— 1	7 4	—	.....
22	1890 1889		1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife .. 1859	9 —	3 —	6 —	—	.....
23	1889 1884		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1861	4 7	1 1	3 6	—	.....
24	1890 1869 sev		—	all	—	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife .. 1847 (Husband 1853	6 8 2	1 1 1	5 2 1	—	.....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
{ 3	Ear-ache	Pa	Brother of Husband No. 2.
{ 4	Black fever	Pa	
{ 2		Pa	Brother of Husband No. 1
{ B		Pa	
{ B		Pa	Half-Bro of Wife No 2216 and Bro of Wife No 104
{ B		Pa	Sis of Husb No 940 and Wife No 2757 Parents cousins
{ 1, 1/2	Cold in head	Pa	Brother of Husband No. 5
		Pa	
		Pa	Bro of Husb No 4 First m'ge, second to Wife No 104
{ 3	Scarlet fever	Ia & Neb	
{ 3	Whooping cough	Mo & Neb	
{ B		Manchester	Brother of Husband No. 36 Parents cousins
{ B		Hartford	Sister of Wife No 162.
{ B		Md & Kendall	
{ 3	Scarlet fever.	Md. & Kendall	
		N Y	First marriage; second to Wife No 10
			Died 1887
2	Scarlet fever	N Y	Second marriage, first to Wife No 9
2	Scarlet fever	N Y	
{ B		Ohio	
{ 1	Inflammation	Ohio,	
{ 1 1/2	Scarlet fever	Ohio	Parents cousins Bro of Wife No, 3332, Husb. No 81 Died 1877
{ B	Fall	Ohio	Died 1882
{ B	..	Ohio	Died several years before husband
{ B		Ky	Died 1867
{ -			Died 1866 Not deaf Mo of Husb No 85 and Wife No 2916
	Scarlet fever	Ill	
		Ill.	Parents cousins.
{ 1		Ind	
{ 7	Scarlet fever	Wis & Cal	Sister of Husband No 178.
7	Diphtheria		Attended common schools Divorced 1892
{ 1 1/2	Humors	Clarke & H. M	First marriage, second to Husband No. 3910
	Scarlet fever.	Clarke & H'd	Died 1882
{ -			Not deaf
{ B			Sister of Husband No. 256. Father was nephew to mother
{ 2	Scarlet fever.	Mich & Coll	
{ -			Not deaf.
{ 7	Brain fever	Mich	Not deaf.
{ B		England	
{ 1 1/2	Slow fever...	Hartford	Sister of Husband No. 4064 Parents cousins
{ 3	Sores in the head.	Ohio. . .	
{ 9	Brain fever...	Ohio .....	
{ 4	infl'n in the head.	Ohio & Ill	
{ 8	Brain fever.....	Ill .....	
{ 3	Sickness.....	Ohio & Mich	
{ 1 1/2	Scarlet fever.....	Mich .....	

Reference number.	MARRIAGES.				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE								Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children			Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]						
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing		Unknown.	Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.		
26	1889	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1854	8 10	1 1	7 9	—	—	
27	1890	1858	1	1	—	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1818	7 3	2 3	5	—	1 niece (Wife No 2596); 2 nephews 1 cousin .. ..	
28	1890	1860	4	2	2	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife .. ..	3 2	3	—	—	Parents (No. 60), 3 nieces (Wife No 363 is one) Father (Husb No. 784), .. ..	
29	1895	1857	5	—	4	1	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1826	7 10	2 3	5 7	—	2 nephews (Husb. No 3547 is or niece (Wife No 363)	
30	1894	1863	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1836	12 9	1 1	11 8	—	—	
31	1890	1883	4	—	3	1	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1858	5 5	— 1	5 4	—	—	
32	1890						{ Husband 1851 Wife .. ..	1	1			—	
33	1890	1882	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1857	7 6	1 3	6 3	—	Second cousin	
34	1890		2	2	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1842	4 3	1 2	3 1	—	.. .. .	
35	1892						{ Husband Wife .. ..	1 1	1 1			.. .. .	
36	1890	1852	4	3	—	1	{ Husband 1823 Wife .. ..	14 2	7 2	7	—	1 nephew, 5 nieces .. ..	
37	1890		1			1	{ Husband 1828 Wife 1825	1 1	1 1			.. .. .	
38	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1827 Wife 1839	1 5	1 5	—	—	Parents (No 4073); uncle; a No 86); aunt (Wife No 404 2 cousins (Wife No. 2166 and 4336).	
39	1890		1			1	{ Husband Wife .. ..	2	1		1	.. .. .	
40	1893	1888	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1869	7 1	1 1	6	—	Cousin .. .. .	
41	1890						{ Husband Wife .. ..					.. .. .	
42	1892	1839					{ Husband 1867 Wife .. ..	1	1			—	
43	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife 1859	1 1	1 1			—	
44	1890	sev	—	—	all	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife .. ..	1 1	1 1			.. .. .	
45	1892						{ Husband Wife .. ..	1 1	1 1			.. .. .	
46	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1815 Wife 1815	6 5or6	1 1	5 4or5	—	.. .. .	
47	1891	....	2		1	1	{ Husband Wife .. ..	1	1			.. .. .	
48	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife .. ..	1	1			.. .. .	
49	1890	....	1			1	{ Husband 1862 Wife .. ..	2 1	1 1	1	—	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

AGE OF MARRIAGE	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
B		Minn . . .	
B	. . .	Minn	
B	.. . . .	Hartford . .	Brother of Husband No 56 Died 1876.
B	.. .	Hartford	
1	Cold in head	Hartford	Brother of Wife No 243 and Wife No. 1859.
—	—	—	Not deaf
B		Ohio	
1	Congestion . .	Ohio.	Sister of Husb No 3386 and Wife No. 2434 Died 1893.
14 $\frac{3}{2}$	Scarlet fever.	Hartford	
13 $\frac{1}{2}$	Scarlet fever.	Hartford . . .	
—	—	—	Not deaf.
2	Scarlet fever	Mo	
B	...	Ga	
7	Fall	N Y & Coll	
B		Hartford . .	Sister of Husband No 3411 and Husband No 3596
8 $\frac{1}{2}$	Scarlet fever	Hartford	
B		Hartford	
{		.....	
B		N. Y .	Brother of Husband No 7 Parents cousins
2	A fit	N Y .	
		N Y . .	
B		N. Y	First marriage, second to Wife No 110
		N Y	
{		.. .	
{		.....	
12	Cerebro-sp Men.	Ia. & College	
3	Cerebro-sp Men	Kendall .	
4	Scarlet fever.	Ga.	Parents cousins Divorced
—	—	—	Not deaf
14 $\frac{1}{2}$	3d attack typ fev.	Kendall & Coll.	First marriage; second to Wife No. 43
—	—	—	Not deaf. Separated
14 $\frac{1}{2}$	3d attack typ. fev.	Kendall & Coll	Second marriage; first to Wife No 42 Separated 1892
3	Brain fever ...	Mich	
2	Fever	Ill	
{	.....	.....	
{	.....	.....	
1	Illness. ....	Pa..	
		Hartford	
4	Cerebro-sp. men	N. Y. Imp'd.	First marriage; second to Husband No. 1831.
—	—	Tenn.....	
—	—	—	Not deaf.
1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Spotted fever....	Mich. ....	
..	.....	N. Y. ....	
B	.....	H'd & N. Y...	
19	.....	.....	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES.				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.							Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sister nor children ]	
	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children.			Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son recorded ]						
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing		Unknown	Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
61	1892					{ Husband { Wife		1 1	1 1				.....
62	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1809	1 1	1 1				.....
63	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1838	3	1	2	—	Niece	
64	1892	1876	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1852	5 1	1 1	4	—		.....
65	1892					{ Husband { Wife		1 1	1 1				.....
66	1894	1862	6	3	3	—	{ Husband { Wife	1835 1844	7 4	2 2	5 2	Nephew	...
67	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1835	4 1	2 1	2	—		.....
68	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1861	3	3				
69	1891	1891	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1865	2	1	1	—		.....
70	1890	1831	3	3	—	{ Husband { Wife	1803 1808	1 1	1 1				.....
71	1892	1892	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1863 1871	1 10	1 1	— 9	—		.....
72	1891		3	—	3	—	{ Husband { Wife		1 1	1 1			.....
73	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1859 1896	1 1	1 1				.....
74	1893	1893	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1868	1	1				.....
75	1890		3			3	{ Husband { Wife	1869	1	1			.....
76	1890		1	1	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1838 1838	1 1	1 1			.....
77	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1859 1859	1 1	1 1				.....
78	1890	1890	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1853 1866	6 1	1 1	5 —	—		.....
79	1893					{ Husband { Wife		1	1				.....
80	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1846 1852	1 5	1 1	4	—		.....
81	1894	1842	6	—	6	—	{ Husband { Wife	1819 1812	1 3	1 1	2	—	.....
82	1890	1867	3	—	3	—	{ Husband { Wife	1842 1849	8 1	2 1	6	—	.....
83	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1824 1824	6 2	1 2	5	—	Cousin .....	
84	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1824	8	1	5	—	Cousin .....	
85	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1824	6 8	1 2	5 6	—	Uncle (Husb. No. 4083); cous	
86	1890					{ Husband { Wife	1882	1 5	1 1	4	—	.....	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
	.. ..	Ontario .	
	.. ..	Hartford	
2	Fits. ....	Va	Not deaf First marriage, second to Husband No 1533
1 1/2	Epilepsy . . .	Ohio	
5	Epilepsy	Ky	Second marriage, first to Husband No 1368, died 1892.
			Not deaf
		St Louis Day	
B		Hartford	Brother of Husband No 27
B		Hartford	Mother of Wife No 2157.
B	Scrofula	Hartford	
Inf	Scarlet fever		
6	Scarlet fever	Minn	Brother is partly deaf Not deaf
B		Hartford	Died 1882
B		Hartford	Died 1854. Mother of Wife No 243, Husband No 28, and Wife No 1859
1 1/2	Fright	N. Y	
1 1/2	Spinal mening's	St Jos, N Y	
		Tenn	Died 1891
		Tenn	
B		Ind	
1 1/2	Catarrh in head	Ind. & Ill	
4	Spotted fever	Ia	Not deaf Died 1893
5	Rising in head	Mo	Parents cousins Dead
B		Ind	Divorced
B		Ind.	
5	Typhoid fever	Mo . . . .	
4	Head complaint.	Mo	
2	Fever	Ia .. .	
3	Convulsions	Neb & Kan	
1 1/2	Ate jimson seed.	Ky . .	
1		Ill	
		Ia	
Inf	Sickness.	Hartford	Died 1894.
2	Brain fever. . .	Hartford .....	
B		Hartford	
B		Hartford	
B		Hartford	First marriage; second to Wife No. 74.
B		Hartford	Divorced
B		Hartford	Second marriage; first to Wife No 73
B			Uneducated. Sister of Husb No 3229. Second marriage; first to Husb No 506
B			First marriage; second to Wife No 76
B		Hartford	Died 1866.
Inf			Second marriage; first to Wife No. 75
		Hartford	First marriage; second to Husb. No 2172

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE							
	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Per-son recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and nor children.]
								Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
77	1890	sev	—	all	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1859		1 3	1 3			
78	1892		1		1	{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			
79	1890	1888	—	—	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1867		6 6	1 2	5 3	—	
80	1894	1892	1		1	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1869		5 2	2 2	3 —	—	
81	1891		1		1	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1856		5 8	3 3	2 5	—	Niece (daughter of a hearing b
82	1892	1891	1		1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1869		5 7	1 3	4 4	—	2 fourth cousins (one is Wife N
83	1890	1866	2	—	2	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1835		4 10	1 1	3 9	—	Cousin
84	1890	1866	1	—	1	{ Husband 1825 Wife		4 6	1 —	3 6	—	
85	1890	1884	2	—	2	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1858		5 6	3 1	2 5	—	Aunt, uncle, father (Husb. N
86	1890		6	2	4	{ Husband Wife		10	3	7	—	Mother (Wife No 1911), uncle, 5 or nieces (one is Wife No 38) 2 nephews; niece
87	1892	1876	4	3	1	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1855		12 4	6 1	6 3	—	4 nephews; 2 nieces
88	1892	1892	—	—	—	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1859		12 5	6 3	6 2	—	2 nephews, niece
89	1892	1865	3	3	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1844		12 8	6 2	6 6	—	2 nephews, niece
90	1892	1875	5	—	5	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1851		12 1	6 1	6 1	—	2 nephews, niece
91	1891	1885	3	—	2	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1861		10 5	1 1	9 4	—	
92	1890		3	—	3	{ Husband 1812 Wife 1814		8 8	1 1	7 7	—	Cousin
93	1889		1	1		{ Husband Wife		1	1			
94	1892	1892	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			
95	1892		2	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife		2 3	1 2	1 1	—	
96	1890	1836	.			{ Husband Wife		1 1				
97	1890					{ Husband 1821 Wife		7 1	1 1	6 —	—	
98	1890					{ Husband 1821 Wife 1817		1 2	1 2			
99	1893		3		1	{ Husband 1808 Wife		3	1	2	—	
100	1890					{ Husband 1859 Wife		1 1	1 1			Second cousin
101	1892	1868	3	—	3	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1845		4 5	1 1	3 —	4	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

of deafness	gned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	
14 B	Intermit fever	Ill Ill	Sister of Husb No 2358
	Brain fever	Wis Wis	Sister of Wife No 2699
B B		Ill	Parents cousins Brother of Wife No 3157.
B		Ohio Ohio	Parents cousins Bro of Husb No 12 and Wife No 3332 Sister of Wife No 189 and Husb No 3418
4 B	Brain fever	Pa Pa	
8 4	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Ky	First marriage, second to Wife No. 84 Died 1885. Died 1859
8 —	Scarlet fever		Second marriage, first to Wife No 83 Died 1885 Not deaf
2 1/2	Scarlet fever Congestive chill	Ind Mo	Brother of Wife No 2916.
— —			Not deaf Sister of Wife No 4041 and Wife No. 558 Mother of Wife No 2166 and Wife No 4336
B 1 1/2	Mumps	Ind Ind	Bro of Husb No 88, Husb No 89, and Wife No. 3848.
B 4	Scarlet fever	Ind Ind	Bro of Husb No 87, Husb No 89, and Wife No 3848. Sister of Husb No 2165
B B		Ind Ind..	First marriage, second to Wife No 90 Bro of Husb No. 87, Husb No 88, and Wife No 3848 Sister of Husb No 1183
12 12	Spinal meningitis	Ind Ind	Second marriage; first to Wife No 89 Bro. of Husb. No. 87, Husb No 88, and Wife No 3848
2 1 1/4	Colds Cramps	Cal Cal	
B 1 1/2	Typhus fever	Hartford Hartford	Died 1851
— —			Not deaf Uneducated. Mother of Husb No. 13
B —		W Va.	Died 1891 Separated First marriage, second to Husb No. 550
1 1/2	Palsy	H't'd & N. Y.	Not deaf
2 1/2 —	Inflam in head	Hartford	
8 B	Inflam in head	N Y. N. Y.	Dead. Second marriage, first to Husb. No. 1717
1 —	Sickness	Hartford	Died 1884 Not deaf
2	Measles	Ill.	
1 1/4 1 3/4	Bad cold	Ind. Ind. Ohio.	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES.				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and nor children]			
	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total		Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown
103	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1830 Wife 1833	6 7	1 4	5 3	—	Second cousin, 2 cousins, gra
104	1893	1890	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1856	7 9	2 3	5 6	—	Nephew and niece Cousin
105	1891	1847	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1821 Wife 1823	4 4	1 1	3 3	—	
106	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
107	1892	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
108	1890	1840	7	—	7	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife 1821	3	1	2	—	
109	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1839 Wife 1841	4 1	1 1	3 —	—	
110	1894	1876	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1827 Wife 1820	1 1	1 1	—	—	
111	1894	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1864	7 5	1 1	6 4	—	
112	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1871 Wife 1874	2 1	1 1	1 —	—	Cousin
113	1894	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife 1869	9 3	3 1	6 2	—	.....
114	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1868	5 5	3 1	2 7	—	Aunt
115	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1865	2 3	1 1	1 2	—	
116	1894	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
117	1895	1874	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
118	1895	1872	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1831 Wife	1	1	—	—	
119	1895	—	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
120	1895	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1850	1 1	1 1	—	—	
121	1890	—	1	1	—	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife	1	1	—	—	
122	1889	1857	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1822	12 13	1 1	11 12	—	
123	1889	—	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1837	7 1	1 1	6 —	—	
124	1890	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1836	6 2	3 1	3 1	—	3 second cousins
125	1890	—	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1851	7 4	4 1	3 3	—	
126	1889	—	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1823 Wife	2 3	2 1	— 2	—	Niece (Wife No. 1270)
127	1889	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1823 Wife 1839	2 4	2 2	— 2	—	Niece (Wife No. 1270)
							{ Husband 1890	2	2	—	—	Niece (Wife No. 1270).

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
1 B	Dropsy on brain	Hartford, Hartford	Sister of Wife No 2241 and Wife No 2333
{ B { B		Pa Pa. & C N Y	Bro of Husb No 4 Second marriage first to Wife No 5 Sister of Husb No 3 half sister of Wife No 2216
{ 1 1/2 { 3	Illness	Hartford Hartford	Died 1891
{ { {		Ga	Died 1885
{ { {			Not deaf Died 1885
{ 4 { B	Fever Typhus fever	Hartford Hartford Hartford	
{ {		N Y N Y	Second marriage first to Wife No 38
{ 1/ { 1	Catarrhal fever Catarrhal fever	Pa Pa	
{ 1 1/2 { B	Fever	Kans Kans	
{ B { 3 1/2	Scarlet fever	Ia Ia & Ill	
{ 3 { 4	Scarlet fever Spotted fever	Le Conteux Le Conteux	Brother of Wife No 3408
{ { 1	Cholera infantum	Hartford W N Y & N Y	
{ 2 { {	Brain fever	Va  Tenn Tenn	
{ 9 { { { {	Scarlet fever	N Y  Ky  Probably Eng	Not deaf
{ 3 { B { 7	Disease in head Fall	N Y N Y N Y	Mother of Wife No 155
{ 3 1/2 { 8	Dropsy in head Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	
{ B { 3	Fall	Pa Pa	Brother of Wife No 2940 Died 1885
{ 7 1/2 { 1 1/2	Cold Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	Bro of Wife No 1634 and Husb No 220
{ B { B { B { B { B { R		Pa Pa Pa Pa Pa Pa	Bro of Husb No 129 First marriage, second to Wife No 127, third to Wife No 128 Bro of Husb No 129 Second marriage, first to Wife No 126, third to Wife No 128 Bro of Husb No 129 Third marriage, first to Wife No. 126 second to Wife No 127

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES						PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE						Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and nor children )
	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per- son recorded )					
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		
129	1893	1857	3	1	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1821 1	2 1	2 1	— —	— —	..
130	1890		2	2			{ Husband Wife	1847 1846	4 27	2 27	2 —	— —	3 third cousins
131	1892		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1844 1850	5 12	4 1	1 11	— —	1 cousin
132	1891	1876	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1854	12 12	1 1	11 —	— —	..
133	1892	1878	3	1	—	2	{ Husband Wife	1856 1856	11 9	6 2	5 7	— —	3 nieces (Wife No 1109 and 1593), 1 nephew 3 nieces (same as husband's),
134	1890		4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1853 1858	5 10	1 3	4 7	— —	—
135	1892	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1867	sev 9	2 3	sev 6	— —	—
136	1892	1885	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife	1856 1857	2 2	2 1	— 1	— —	—
137	1890	1888	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1859 1866	12 6	3 1	9 5	— —	Niece (daughter of a hearing Cousin, 2 third cousins
138	1889		3	2	1		{ Husband Wife	1848 1848	2 2	1 1	1 1	— —	—
139	1890	1886	3	—	2	1	{ Husband Wife	1860 1863	5 2	1 1	4 1	— —	2d cousin
140	1890	1859	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1833 1833	11 —	1 —	10 —	— —	3 uncles, 6 cousins (Husb and Wife No 1598), 1 thir
141	1890	1868	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1833 1845	11 7	1 1	10 4	— 2	3 uncles; 6 cousins (Husb & Wife No 1598), 1 third cou Second cousin (Wife No 461)
142	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1861 1867	3 5	1 1	— 4	2 —	..
143	1890	1886	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1850 1864	5 5	1 1	4 4	— —	—
144	1889	1874	6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1839 1856	7 6	1 1	6 5	— —	2 fourth cousins (Husb No No. 268)
145	1889	1884	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1865 1859	3 2	1 1	2 1	— —	Grandfather
146	1890	1875	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1853	3 8	1 4	2 4	— —	—
147	1889	1862	9	—	7	2	{ Husband Wife	1839 1840	5 3	1 1	4 2	— —	—
148	1889	1867	4	3	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1846 1845	1 1	1 1	— —	— —	Mother (Wife No. 3371)
149	1889	1877	4	—	2	2	{ Husband Wife	1847 1867	3 6	— 1	3 5	— —	Mother partly, uncle slight Uncle, aunt, 2 cousins, ali
150	1889	1868	4	1	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1822 1815	5 3	1 3	1 3	— —	—
151	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1822 1815	5 3	1 3	4 —	— —	3 third cousins 3 cousins (Husb No 934)
152	1890	1870	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1822 1824	5 1	1 1	4 —	— —	3 third cousins 3 third cousins

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
Inf B	Cold	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 126 Mother of Wife No 1270 and Wife No 3889
B B		Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 221
B B		Ill Mo	Bro of Wife No 4001, Wife No 3553, and Wife No 3626
2	Brain fever	Ill	Not deaf Died 1891. First marriage, second to Husb No 1303
B		Kendall & Md	Bro of Wife No 2461, Wife No 2902, Wife No 3355, Wife No, 3141, Wife No 4331
5	Scarlet rash	Pa	Sister of Husb No 4331 Parents second cousins
B B		Pa Pa	Sister of Husb No 2894, Wife No 2233
2 B	Scarlet fever	Texas Ark	Sister of Husb No 2440
B 3	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	
(1)½ (1)½	Typhoid fever Brain fever	Le Conteuix Le Conteuix	
—		—	Not deaf
1	Cold	Pa	
B (1)½	Spotted fever	Pa Pa ....	
B —		Hartford —	First marriage, second to Wife No 141 Not deaf
B 2	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 140
B 6	Brain fever	Hartford R I	
17 8	Cerebro-sp men Cerebro-sp men	Wis & College Ill	
(1)½ 3	Fall Marasmus	Hartford Kendall	Parents first cousins
8 B	Spotted fever	Pa Pa	
B		Ark Ark	Sister of Husb No. 2895 and Wife No. 4008
(2)½ (	Sickness	Gmund Winnenden .	
3 B	Fall	Pa Pa	Mother of Wife No 1366.
(4)½	Scarlet fever	—	Not deaf Educated chiefly at home
17 —	Gath'g in ears.	— —	Educated in common schools Not deaf
B B	... ...	N Y N Y	Parents cousins First marriage, second to Wife No 152. Died 1889
B B	... ...	N. Y N. Y.....	Dead. Parents consins. Second marriage; first to Wife No. 151 Died 1889.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number	MARRIAGES				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.								Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and nor children.]
	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son recorded.]					
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
153	1890	1878	2	—	1	1	{Husband {Wife	1843 1854	14 6	1 2	13 4	—	—
154	1893	1886	3	—	1	2	{Husband {Wife	1857 1863	2 3	1 1	1 2	—	—
155	1889	1887	2	—	2	—	{Husband {Wife	1856 1858	2 1	1 —	1 —	—	9d cousin Parents (No 122)
156	1889	1877	6	1	5	—	{Husband {Wife	1854 1856	11 12	— 5	11 7	—	Father (Husb No 3377), un- No 3380), aunt (Wife No cousins (Husb No 3379 nephews and nieces, 2 seco (Husb No 3687 is one).
157	1890	1877	4	—	4	—	{Husband {Wife	1843 1854	11 6	1 —	10 5	—	—
158	1890	1880	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1845 1857	6 1	3 1	2 —	1	—
159	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1851 1860	6 1	3 1	2 —	1	—
160	1890	1881	4	1	3	—	{Husband {Wife	1858 1858	6 1	1 1	5 —	—	Cousin
161	1890	1881	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1855 1850	9 4	1 2	8 2	—	Mother, aunt, uncle, partly
162	1893	1866	4	—	4	—	{Husband {Wife	1856 1845	7 3	1 3	6 —	—	Parents (No 2421), uncle 421), 6 nephews and niece
163	1889	1887	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1858 1857	4 7	1 2	3 5	—	—
164	1893	1883	5	—	3	2	{Husband {Wife	1860 1857	4 6	2 1	2 5	—	—
165	1889	1881	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1847 1856	9 3	1 1	8 2	—	—
166	1893	1888	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1847 1859	9 3	1 1	8 2	—	—
167	1890	1834	5	—	5	—	{Husband {Wife	1809 1814	5 4	3 1	2 3	—	..
168	1889	1861	2	1	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1828 1830	12 4	3 1	9 3	—	.
169	1893	1886	3	—	3	—	{Husband {Wife	1857 1861	8 7	1 1	7 6	—	—
170	1889	1864	2	—	2	—	{Husband {Wife	1821 1840	8 6	1 1	7 5	—	.
171	1889	1880	—	—	—	—	{Husband {Wife	1844 1844	6 7	1 2	5 5	—	..
172	1891	1887	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1859 1864	6 5	1 1	5 4	—	—
173	1894	1857	8	—	7	1	{Husband {Wife	1822 1840	10 12	2 3	8 9	—	..
174	1894	1877	1	—	1	—	{Husband {Wife	1822 1852	10 6	2 1	8 5	—	..
175	1889	1852	10	—	10	—	{Husband {Wife	1822 1834	10 6	2 1	8 5	—	... ..
176	1889	1874	6	—	6	—	{Husband {Wife	1822 1847	10 6	2 1	8 6	—	.....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
4 B	Scarlet fever	Ill Mo	Sister of Wife No. 2462
	Scarlet fever Brain fever	Pa N Y Imp'd	
1 1/2	Scarlet fever	Kendall & Col	Not deaf
	Gathering in ear	Iowa	Not deaf Only one of the relatives born deaf (Husb No 3379); Sister of Wife No 4333, Husb No 3378, Wife No 2405, and Wife No 3116
1 2	Scarlet fever	Iowa	Not deaf
B	Fits	Ky, Ill, Neb Neb	Brother of Husb No 159 and Wife No 3405
		Ill, Neb Iowa	Brother of Husb No 158 and Wife No 3405 Deserted husband, divorced
1 1/2 4	Fits Diphtheria	Md Md	
	Scarlet fever	Kendall & Md Kendall	
	Intermit fever	Ohio & Ind Hartford	Sister of Wife No 7
17 B	Scarlet fever	Ill	Educated in public schools Sister of Wife No 551
6 1	Fall Ulcer sore throat	Md Kendall	
17 11	Typ'd fev & cold	Ill Ill	First marriage, second to Wife No 166 Died 1884
17 B	Typ'd fev & cold	Ill Ill	Second marriage, first to Wife No 165
7 —	Spotted fever	Hartford	Died 1857 Not deaf Died 1890
1 1/2	Cold	Ohio	Brother of Husb No 295 Never at school Mother of Wife No 1135
7 B	Sickness	Ohio O & LeConte's	
1 1/2 1 1/2	Sickness Scarlet fever	Ohio Ohio	
3 1 1/2	Inflam of brain Boiling coffee	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage; first to Husb No 3393; sister of Husb No 1816
2 B	Diphtheria	Ohio Ohio	
		Ohio	Died 1894 Bro of Husb No. 175 First marriage; second to Wife No 174
B		Tenn	Died 1875 Parents cousins. Sister of Wife No 178 and Wife No 1373
5	Cold	Ohio Ky	Died 1894 Bro of Husb, No 175 Second marriage; first to Wife No 173.
2	Disease in head.	Ohio Tenn	Bro of Husb No 173 1st marriage; 2d to Wife No. 176. Dead
2 1 1/2	Disease in head. Typhoid fever.	Ohio. Minn. & Ind.	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 175.
3 2	Sickness	Ohio	Died 1889.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]	
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
178	1890	1867	8	—	8	—	Husband	1849	5	2	3	Niece	—
							Wife	1847	12	3	9		
179	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	Husband	1842	4	1	3	"Yes, on father's side"	—
							Wife	1848	12	1	11		
180	1889	1885	1	—	—	1	Husband	1851	10	3	7	4 cousins (Husb No 1960 is one)	—
							Wife	1856	9	3	6		
181	1889	1885	—	—	—	—	Husband	1861	8	1	7	—	—
							Wife	1865	8	1	7		
182	1889		2	—	2	—	Husband	1827	4	1	3	—	—
							Wife	1829	1	1	—		
183	1889	1895	1	—	1	—	Husband	1827	4	1	3	3 fourth cousins (one is Husb No 1	—
							Wife	1828	11	2	9		
184	1892	1888	1	—	1	—	Husband	1860	6	2	4	—	—
							Wife	1869	7	3	4		
185	1890	1880	2	—	2	—	Husband	1846	4	1	3	—	—
							Wife	1855	3	1	2		
186	1890	1863	4	—	4	—	Husband	1828	11	3	8	—	—
							Wife	1840	9	1	8		
187	1893	1872	1	—	1	—	Husband	1843	9	6	3	—	—
							Wife	1849	8	1	7		
188	1890	1877	3	—	3	—	Husband	1853	9	6	3	—	—
							Wife	1853	8	1	7		
189	1890	1872	1	—	1	—	Husband	1840	4	2	2	2 cousins (Husb No 290 is one)	—
							Wife	1850	8	3	5		
190	1890	1889	1	—	—	1	Husband	1859	3	1	2	An aunt	—
							Wife	1863	2	1	1		
191	1889	1865	—	—	—	—	Husband		1	1	—	3 cousins (Husb No 921 and Wife 1693)	—
							Wife		6	1	5		
192	1889	1879	2	—	2	—	Husband	1846	5	1	4	—	—
							Wife		2	1	1		
193	1890		3	—	3	—	Husband	1833	1	1	—	. . . . .	. . . . .
							Wife						
194	1892	1858	3	—	3	—	Husband	1820	12	3	9	Great aunt	—
							Wife	1832	1	1	—		
195	1892	1875	—	—	—	—	Husband	1829	12	3	9	Great aunt	. . . . .
							Wife	1829	4	2	2		
196	1889	1860	5	—	5	—	Husband	1835	10	1	9	—	—
							Wife		8	—	8		
197	1891	1889	1	—	1	—	Husband	1865	2	1	1	—	—
							Wife	1869	3	1	2		
198	1889	1863	8	—	5	3	Husband		1	1	—	. . . . .	. . . . .
							Wife		1	1	—		
199	1890	1881	—	—	—	—	Husband	1854	6	1	5	—	—
							Wife	1854	4	1	3		
200	1890	1870	2	—	2	—	Husband	1837	3	1	2	. . . . .	. . . . .
							Wife	1837	4	1	3		
201	1889	1886	2	—	2	—	Husband	1865	5	1	4	Nephew	—
							Wife		8	5	3		
202	1889	1850	8	—	8	—	Husband	1822	5	1	4	. . . . .	. . . . .
							Wife						
203	1890	1891	0	0	0	0	Husband	1822	5	1	4	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
8 { 5 8	Scarlet fever Medicine	Wis & Cal Tenn	Brother of Wife No 16 Parents cousins Sis of Wife No 173 and Wife No 1373
9 { 5 2	Fever Fit and fever	N Y West N Y	Parents cousins
20 { B B		Kans Kans & Mo	Husband and Wife cousins Sis of Husb No 1960 Second marriage, first to Husb. No 566
21 { 1 2	Brain fever Scarlet fever	Kans Kans	
22 { Inf 1 1/2	Fall Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	First marriage, second to Wife No 183 Dead
23 { Inf Inf	Fall Sickness	Pa Pa	Second marriage, first to Wife No 182 Second marriage, first to Husb No 648
24 { B 6	Brain fever	Ont Ont	Sister of Wife No 3749
25 { B B		Cal Ohio	
26 { B B		Illa Ohio	Brother of Husb No 282 and Husb. No 283
27 { B B		Ohio Ohio	Died 1893 Bro of Wife No 2057, Husb No 188, and Husb No 285
28 { B 3 1/2	Worm fever	Ohio Ohio	Bro of Husb No 187, Husb No 285, and Wife No 2057
29 { 1 1/2 B	Scarlet fever	N Y Ohio	Sister of Husb No 3418 and Wife No 81
30 { 2 1/2 6 w	Scarlet fever Scrofula	Ohio.	Self-educated
31 { }		Ky Germany .	
32 { B 10	Mumps	Ont Ont	
33 { B —		S C	Not deaf
34 { B 1 1/2	Whooping cough	Ohio Ohio	Died 1892 Parents cousins Bro of Wife No 2441 First marriage, second to Wife No 195, Died 1874
35 { B B		Ohio Ohio	Died 1892. Parents cousins Bro of Wife No. 2441. Second marriage, first to Wife No 194
36 { — —	Sickness	Ohio	Not deaf Mother of Wife No 3529
37 { 1 1/2 4	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Ohio Ohio	
38 { }		Baden . . Baden	
39 { 3 2 1/2	Inflam of brain.	N Y & H Mann Hartford	
40 { 2 18	Scarlet fever	N Y, Ohio & Mich	
41 { 8 B	Scarlet fever . ...	Montreal Cath .. ..	Sister of Husb. No. 3800, Husb. No. 3799, Wife No. 3394, and Wife No. 2801.
42 { 9 —	Sl'g on damp floor —	London —	First marriage, second to Wife No 203, Not deaf. Died 1876.
43 { 9 —	Sl'g on damp floor	London .. Washington	Second marriage; first to Wife No. 202.



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES					PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE					Deaf Relatives. [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]	
	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per-son recorded)				
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing		Unknown
204	1890	1858	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1835 Wife 1835	3 2	2 1	1 1	—	2 nephews Cousin
205	1890		3	2	1	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1835	3 2	2 1	1 1	—	Cousin
206	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1857	5 4	2 1	3 3	—	Cousin
207	1890	1882	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1860	6 3	1 1	5 2	—	
208	1889	1881	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1860	1	1	—	—	
209	1890	1871	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1850	1 4	1 1	—	3	
210	1889	1884	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife 1869	— 5	— 3	2 —	—	
211	1889	1857	5	1	2	1	{ Husband 1822 Wife 1838	9 5	1 2	4 3	—	3d cousin (Wife No 4299) Parents (No 1826), uncle granduncle (Husb No 1824); grandaunt, 8 2d cousins (including Husb No 1687, Husb No 1825, Husb No 3199), 3 3d cousins (including Wife No 1453 and Husb No 3201), 2 4th cousins
212	1890	1877	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1858	9 8	1 1	8 7	—	
213	1889	1883	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife	6	1	5	—	
214	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife	5 7	2 1	3 6	—	3d cousin
215	1890	1882	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1863	5 9	1 4	4 5	—	
216	1890	1880	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1855	5 9	2 1	3 8	—	
217	1891	1889	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1866	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	
218	1890	1880	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1860	4 3	1 1	3 2	—	
219	1889	1856	8	—	8	—	{ Husband 1834 Wife 1829	9 5	— 1	9 4	—	
220	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1857	7 1	4 1	3 1	—	
221	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1831	4 2	2 2	2 —	—	2 nieces or nephews
222	1889	1840	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1810 Wife 1817	6 9	1 1	5 8	—	
223	1891	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1862	3 2	1 1	2 1	—	
224	1890	1863	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1834 Wife 1836	2 2	1 2	1 —	—	
225	1891	1888	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1864	2 4	1 1	1 —	3	
226	1889		2	1	1	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1860	3 7	1 2	2 5	—	3 second cousins (Wife No. 2215, Wife No 1231)
227	1889	1844	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1812 Wife 1823	1 3	1 1	2 —	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
204	{ B	—	S C Hart & S C	Dead Brother of Husb No 205 First marriage, second to Husb No 205
205	{ B	—	Hart, & S C	Partly deaf from birth Brother of Husb No 204 Second marriage, first to Husb No 204
206	{ B 6	Scarlet fever	Hartford Clarke	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 216, third to Wife No 565
207	{ 3 J	Scarlet fever Diphtheria	Hartford Hartford	
208	{ — B	—	—	Not deaf 1 child hard of hearing from sickness at 3 years of age
209	{ 2½ 1½	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Hartford Clarke & Hart	Parents distantly related
210	{ — B	—	—	Not deaf Sister of Husb No 3134
211	{ 5 B	Boils in the ears	Ky Ky	Died 1865 First marriage; second to Husb No 3412 Sister of Husb No 1676
212	{ 10 2	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Died 1888 First marriage, second to Husb No 1511. Died 1892
213	{ 21 —	Meningitis	Minn —	Not deaf
214	{ B 1½	—	Hartford H M, Clarke & Hartford	Parents first cousins
215	{ 6 B	Spotted fever	Minn Wis	Sister of Husb No 266
216	{ B 1	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	First marriage, 2d to Wife No 206, 3d to Wife No 565 Died 1882.
217	{ 1½ 1½	Fever, Teething	Ohio, Ohio	
218	{ 9 4	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Pa Pa	Separated
219	{ — 4	— Typhoid fever	—	Not deaf Uneducated
220	{ B —	—	Pa Ill	Brother of Husb No 125 and Wife No 1634
221	{ 3 2	Sickness	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb 139 Sister of Wife No. 224
222	{ 4 4	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Hartford Hartford	
223	{ 4 2	Typhoid fever Brain fever	Pa Pa	
224	{ B B	—	Pa Pa	Sister of Wife No. 221
225	{ 1½ 2	Spotted fever Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	
226	{ B 4	— Typhoid fever	Pa Pa	Sister of Husb No 1401.
227	{ 2½ —	A severe illness.	Pa Pa, 4	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES										PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE									
Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)							
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown								
228	1889	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1867	5 4	1 —	4 4	—	—							
229	1889	1870	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1834 Wife 1855	6 6	1 6	5 —	—	Parents (No 4264), 4 uncles (including Husb No 1377, Husb No. 1376, and Husb No 1379), and 3 aunts (Wife No 1377 is one)							
230	1890	1872	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1848	9 5	1 1	8 4	—	Cousin Cousin							
231	1890	1878	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1848	1 3	1 1	1 2	—	—							
232	1890	1882	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1855	sev 5	1 1	sev 4	—	Cousin (Wife No 3162)							
233	1890	1866	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1845	sev 6	2 1	sev 5	—	2 cousins (Husb No 446 is one), 2 nephews (Husb. No 2424 and Husb No 2426), and 3 grandnieces							
234	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1859	5 8	1 7	4 1	—	Cousin							
235	1890	1844	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1824 Wife 1824	1 8	1 1	1 7	—	—							
236	1890	1864	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1839	— 4	— 1	— 3	—	—							
237	1889		4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife 1855	1 9	1 2	1 7	—	—							
238	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1837	3 5	1 1	2 4	—	Aunt							
239	1889		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1857	3 5	3 1	3 4	—	3 second cousins							
240	1890	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1857	2 13	1 1	1 12	—	—							
241	1891	1884	3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1859	6 10	1 1	5 9	—	—							
242	1889	1853	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1831 Wife 1843	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	2 third cousins Father's cousin							
243	1889	1855	7	1	6	—	{ Husband 1829 Wife 1833	6 3	1 3	5 —	—	Parents (No. 60); 4 nieces							
244	1890	1864	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1834 Wife 1841	6 12	2 3	4 9	—	—							
245	1893	1878	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1856	9 7	3 1	6 6	—	—							
246	1889	1865	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife 1834	— 9	— 5	— 4	—	—							
247	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1862	8 6	2 2	6 4	—	1 relative							
248	1889	1850	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1808 Wife 1820	8 2	— 2	8 —	—	—							
249	1890	1870	3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1845	4 11	1 3	3 8	—	Nephew (Husb No 1341)							
250	1889	1866	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1863	4 7	1 1	3 6	—	—							
251	1891	1886	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1865	7 2	2 1	5 1	—	—							

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
29	{ 1½	Drinking lyc	Mich	Not deaf
29	{ B		Ohio	Died 1883
	{ B		N Y	Sister of Husb No 4266
30	{ 2	Catarrh	Pa	Husband and wife cousins
	{ 1		Ind	
31	{ B		Ohio	Abandoned his wife
	{ 4	Fever	Ind	
32	{ B		Nova Scotia	Died 1887
	{ 1½	Scarlet fever	Hartford	
	{ B		N Y	First marriage second to Husb No 565
	{ 1½			
33	{ B		N Y	Died 1876 Brother of Wife No 2425
	{ 1½			
	{ 1½	Spotted fever	Mich	Died 1877
	{ 1½			
234	{ 5	Smallpox	Ind	Parents first cousins
	{ B		Ind	
235	{ 12	Fall		Dead
	{ 2	Diphtheria	Dublin	
	{ 2			First marriage, second to Husb No 2889
	{ 2			
236	{ —			Not deaf
	{ 9	Measles	Cal	
	{ 9			Divorced about 1875
	{ 9			
237	{ B		Pa	Educated in hearing schools
	{ B			
238	{ B		Pa	Died 1833
	{ 1½	Scarlatina	Pa	
239	{ B		Pa	Parents cousins
	{ B		Pa	
240	{ 3		Ind	
	{ 6	Brain fever	Ind	
241	{ 7	Spinal disease	N. Y	
	{ 7	Brain fever	Central N Y	
242	{ B		N Y	
	{ 2	Scarlet fever	N Y	
243	{ 3	Scarlet fever	Pa	Died 1891
	{ 3	Scarlet fever	Hartford	
244	{ B		Mich	Sister of Wife No 270, Husb No 28 Mother of Wife No 2517 Died 1893
	{ 1	Whooping cough or measles	Mich	
245	{ 9		Wis	Parents cousins Sister of Wife No 2499 Died 1867
	{ 9	Brain fever	Wis	
246	{ —			Brother of Wife No 1271 Died 1893
	{ B		Ohio	
247	{ Inf		Ky	Not deaf Died 1873
	{ B		Ky	
248	{ —			Sister of Husb No 2475, Husb No 2500, Wife No 1680, Wife No 4315
	{ —		Ohio	
249	{ 11	Scarlet fever	Wis	Died 1889 Sister of Wife No 295
	{ B		Wis	
250	{ 3	Scarlet fever	Mich	Parents first cousins Sister of Husb No 1342
	{ Inf	Gather'g in head	Mich	
251	{ 1	Scarlet fever	N Y &	Brother of Wife No 1284
	{ 1	Fall	N. Y.	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages

Reference number	MARRIAGES					LABORERS IN MARRIAGE.					Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)	
	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per son recorded)				
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	D af	Hearing		Unknown
452	1890	1882	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1856 Wif 1858	15 4	1 1	14 1	—	Cousin (Husb No 987)
253	1893	1888	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1871	10 5	1 1	9 4	—	—
254	1889	1874	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1844	5 3	2 1	3 2	—	—
255	1891	1875	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 184	7 3	1 1	4 2	—	Mother and brother partially deaf from measles
256	1890	1874	3	1	1	1	{ Husband 1839 Wif 1861	4 3	3 1	1 2	—	Father (Husb No 257) 2 granduncles, 2 aunts (Wife No 2431 is one) 2 cousins (Husb No 2541 and Wife No 3100)
257	1890		4	4	1	—	{ Husband 1822 Wife	3		1	—	2 uncles 1 nephew (Husb No 2541), 1 niece (Wife No 3100) N phaw (Husb No 257)
258	1890	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband and Wife 1864	5	1	4	—	—
259	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1			
260	1890	1829	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1803 Wife 2	6 2	2 2	4 2	—	
261	1890	1881	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1857 Wif 1853	6	1 3	4 3	—	
262	1890		2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1899 Wife 1833	10 4	3 3	7 1	—	Mother was hard of hearing at 25 and gradually became totally deaf more (Wife No 3612)
263	1892	1873					{ Husband 1845 Wife 1863	1 1	1 1			
264	1890	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1802	4 6	1 1	3 5	—	—
265	1890	1854					{ Husband 1816 Wife 1807	5 5	1 1	4 4	—	
266	1892		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1869 Wife	9	4	5	—	—
267	1890						{ Husband 1837 Wife	1	1			
268	1890	1861	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1818 Wife 1835	5 5	1 2	4 3	—	50nd cousin Grandfather partially deaf, 4th cousin (Husb No 144)
269	1891	1868	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife	1 1	1 1			
270	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1840	3	3			Parents (No 60), 3 nieces (one is Wife No 2517)
271	1890	1855	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife	6 5	1 3	5 2	—	—
272	1891	1885	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1859	2 6or7	2 1	— 5or6	—	Second cousin (Wife No 272) 2 second cousins (Husb. No 272 is one)
273	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			
274	1890						{ Husband Wife 1850	1 1	1 1			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
252	{ 1 1/2	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Died 1890
253	{ 3	Diphtheria Spinal fever	Mich Mich	Died 1893 Died 1891
254	{ 5	Scarlet fever	Mich Mich	Brother of Wife No 1444
255	{ 3	Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Brother of Wife No 2688
256	{ 5	Spotted fever	Ind. Ind	Father nephew to mother    Brother of Wife No 19
257	{ —	—	Ohio —	Brother of Wife No 2131    Died 1874 } Not deaf    Mother of Husb No 256 }    Husband and wife related and Wife No 19 } Not deaf
258	{ 1 1/2	Sickness	Mo.	
259	{ —	Chn. Catarrh	—	Not deaf
260	{ B	—	Hartford N Y (Canaj)	Died 1869 Sister of Wife No 1345
261	{ B	—	Ohio Ohio	Died 1888.
262	{ B	—	Hartford	Bro of Wife No 1531, Wife No. 2819, Wife No. 770    Dead
263	{ 2	Measles	Ind. Ind	Sister of Husb No 409, Wife No 3243
264	{ 1 1/4	Cold in head	Minn Minn	
265	{ 1 1/2	Spotted fever Whooping cough.	Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Husb No 4213
266	{ —	—	Wis & Minn —	Brother of Wife No 215 Not deaf.
267	{ 3	Cold	Ill —	Dead. Not deaf
268	{ 3	Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford	Died 1878    Sister of Husb No 1431.
269	{ 4 7	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Separated. First marriage, second to Husb No 3889
270	{ B	—	Hartford	Not deaf. Killed at Bull Run, 1862 First marriage, second to Husb No 1859.    Sister of Wife No 243, Husb No 28
271	{ 1 1/4	Inflam fever	Eng & Hart ..	Sister of Husb No 4069
272	{ 7 3	Quinin. Meningitis.	Ga. Ga.	Parents second consins }    Husband and wife are second cousins
273	{ —	—	—	
274	{ B	—	Wis 4 .. ..	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES.										PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE									
Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)						
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown							
275	1890							(Husband 1821 Wife 1823)	1 1	1 1			Second cousin						
276	1890							(Husband 1847 Wife 1847)	1 2	1 2			Father (Husb No 2148), grandaunt						
277	1890	1855						(Husband 1820 Wife 1820)	1 7	1 3	1 4	—							
278	1893	1893	—	—	—	—		(Husband 1869 Wife 1874)	1 1	1 1									
279	1892							(Husband 1864 Wife 1864)	3	1	2	—							
280	1890							(Husband 1865 Wife 1865)	1	1									
281	1893		2	—	2	—		(Husband 1836 Wife 1836)	1 4	1 2	2	—	2 cousins (Wife No 1253 and Husb N 2476)						
282	1890							(Husband 1838 Wife 1838)	11 1	3 1	8	—							
283	1890							(Husband 1865 Wife 1873)	1 1	1 1									
284	1891	1891	—	—	—	—		(Husband 1862 Wife 1860)	9 4	6 1	3 3	—	1 cousin (Husb No, 1946)						
285	1890	1890	—	—	—	—		(Husband 1861 Wife 1870)	7 6	1 1	6 5	—	Cousin						
286	1893	1891	1	—	—	1		(Husband 1849 Wife 1849)	7	1	6	—							
287	1890							(Husband 1805 Wife 1805)	1	1									
288	1891							(Husband 1823 Wife 1829)	8 5	3 2	5 3	—							
289	1890	1851	5	1	4	—		(Husband 1837 Wife 1855)	2 6	2 1	5	—	2 cousins (Husb. No. 189 is one)						
290	1892	1888	2	—	—	2		(Husband 1805 Wife 1805)	1 1	1 1									
291	1891		1	1				(Husband 1846 Wife 1846)	1	1									
292	1890							(Husband 1835 Wife 1842)	8 13	1 2	7 11	—							
293	1891							(Husband 1820 Wife 1824)	12 2	3 2	9	—	Niece (Wife No. 1135)						
294	1894	1851	7	—	7	—		(Husband 1859 Wife 1859)	1 1	1 1			.....						
295	1891	1891	—	—	—	—		(Husband 1860 Wife 1867)	1 5	1 1	4	—							
296	1890	1885	2	—	2	—		(Husband 1860 Wife 1871)	1 1	1 1									
297	1892	1892	—	—	—	—		(Husband 1826 Wife 1824)	8 4	2 1	6 3	—							
298	1893	1890	—	—	—	—		(Husband 1841 Wife 1841)	1	1									
299	1890		5	—	5	—													
300	1890																		

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

161

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
275	{ B { B		N Y N Y	First marriage Dead
276	{ B		N Y Ill	
277	{ 2½	Ulcers on head	N Y Hartford	Sister of Wife No 2453 Second marriage, first to Husb No 323 Parents cousins
278	{ 1	Cerebro-sp men	Va & Kendall Va	Died 1893
279	{ 2 { —	Inflam of brain	Hartford	Not deaf
280	{ 8 { —	Spotted fever	La Couteulx	Not deaf
281	{ {		Ky Ky	Sister of Husb No 1433 Parents cousins
282	{ B { —		Ill Ia	Brother of Husb No 186 and Husb No 283
283	{ B { —		Ill	Brother of Husb No 186 and Husb No 282
284	{ 5 { 8	Brain fever Measles	Ind Ind	
285	{ B { 6½	Diphtheria	Ohio Ohio	Brother of Husb No 187, Husb No 188, and Wife No 2057.
286	{ 1½ { —	Brain fever	Ohio	Slightly deaf from scarlet fever
287	{ Inf { —	Inflammation	Ala	Not deaf
288	{ {			Deserted his wife 1891
289	{ B { 2½	Ulcers	Hartford Hartford	Brother of Wife No 2127
290	{ B { B		N Y N Y	
291	{ 2½ { 2½	Erysipelas	N Y N Y (?)	
292	{ {		Hartford	Died 1884.
293	{ 1½ { —	Scarlet fever.	N Y	Died 1868 Not deaf
294	{ 2 { 1	Scarlet fever Brain fever	Ill Ia & Minn	Sister of Husb No 1685
295	{ 3 { 3	Sickness	Ohio Ohio	Brother of Husb No 168. Sister of Wife No 248. Died 1894
296	{ ½ { —	Lung fever	Ill & Ind Ind	
297	{ 2 { 1½	Diphtheria Typhoid fever.	Wis Minn	First marriage; second to Wife No 298 Died 1890
298	{ 2 { 6	Diphtheria Scarlet fever.	Wis Minn	Second marriage, first to Wife No 297
299	{ 2 { 2	Scarlet fever. Typhus fever	N Y .. N. Y ...	Brother of Wife No. 2811. Died 1893
300	{ 7 { —	Cold.	— —	Not deaf.



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES										PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE									
Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children.)							
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown								
301	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1807 Wife	1	1										
302	1890						{ Husband 1860 Wife	1	1										
303	1891 1864		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1843	1	1										
304	1892						{ Husband Wife	1	1										
305	1893 1867		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1846	2	1	1	—								
306	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1828	9	1	8	—								
307	1892						{ Husband 1833 Wife	9	1	8	—								
308	1892		2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1833 Wife	9	1	8	—								
309	1889		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1										
310	1890 1873		3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife 1856	3	2	1	—	...							
311	1890 1869		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1869	4	2	2	—	—							
312	1890						{ Husband 1823 Wife	9	3	6	—	..							
313	1890 1858						{ Husband Wife 1832	1	1										
314	1890 1886		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1857	5	3	2	—	—							
315	1890 1868		6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1848	5	3	2	—	—							
316	1893	sev				sev	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1846	1	1										
317	1891 1890		1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1867	4	2	2	—	—							
318	1893 1858	sev			all	—	{ Husband 1819 Wife 1835	5	1	4	—	3 cousins .	..						
319	1890						{ Husband 1819 Wife 1834	5	1	4	—	. . . . .							
320	1893 1866		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1819 Wife 1827	5	1	4	—	. . . . .							
321	1890 1875		4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1850	6	1	5	—	—							
322	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife	9	3	6	—	. . . . .							
323	1890 1863						{ Husband 1825 Wife 1829	5	1	4	—	. . . . .							
324	1892						{ Husband Wife	1	1			. . . . .							
325	1890 1867		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1847	8	1	7	—	. . . . .							
								5	1	4	—	Cousin, . . . . .							

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
301	{ 3	Illness	Hartford	Died 1862 Not deaf
302	{ B		N Y	
303	{ 1 1/2 1 3/4	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Ill Ill	Dead
304	{			
305	{ B X	Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford	Parents second cousins
306	{ 1 1/2 B	Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford	First or second marriage other wife No 307 third marriage to Wife No 308 Died 1871
307	{ 1	Ulcers in head	Hartford	First or second marriage other wife No 306 third marriage to Wife No 309
308	{ 1 1/2	Ulcers in head	Hartford	Third marriage two other wives Nos 306 and 307
309	{ —	—	—	Not deaf
310	{ — B	—	Hartford	Not deaf
311	{ B J	Scarlet fever and whooping cough	Hartford W Va, Hartford & Whipple s	Parents cousins
312	{ B —	—	Hartford	Brother of Wife No 2998 Not deaf
313	{ B B		N Y N Y	Sister of Wife No 1761 and Wife No 4378
314	{ B 5	Scarlet fever	Va Va	Brother of Husband No 315 One brother hard of hearing Sister of Wife No 2573
315	{ B 7	Typhoid fever	Va Va	Brother of Husband No 314 One brother hard of hearing
316	{ 5 1/2 3	Sickness Scarlet fever	Ill Ill	
317	{ B 8	Measles	Ohio W Pa	
318	{ B B		Hartford Ill	Second marriage first to Wife No 319 third to Wife No 320 Died 1893 Sister of Husb No 1169 and Husb No 1171 Parents cousins
	{ B B		Hartford Ill	First marriage second to Wife No 318, third to Wife No 320 Died 1893
30	{ B 1	Inflam of brain	Hartford Hartford	Third marriage first to Wife No 319, second to Wife No 318 Died 1893 Second marriage, first to Husb No 557
31	{ B 5	Scarlet fever	Ia Ia	
32	{ B —	—	Utah	Not deaf
33	{ Inf 2 1/2	Ulcers in head Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford	Separated. First marriage second to Husb No 277 Parents cousins Sister of Wife No 2353.
34	{ —	—	—	Not deaf
35	{ A 2	Catarrhal fever Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford	

*Annual Statement of Marriages*

MARRIAGES

Reference numbers	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
26	1890	1840	1	—	1		{ Husband 1804 Wife 1808	1 12	1 2	— 10	—	
27	1893	1893	—	—	—		{ Husband 1874 Wife 1874	1 1	1 1	—	—	2 cousins
28	1893	1867	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1847	7 2	1 2	6 —	—	Par nts (No 1055) uncle 2 aunts (Wif No 790 and Wife No 1710)
29	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 4	1 2	— 2	—	Niece (Wife No 2505) nephew, an grandnephew or niece
30	1892	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1860	11 5	1 1	10 4	—	Cousin (Wife No 2191)
31	1893	1893	1			1	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1860	11 2	1 2	10 —	—	
32	1892						{ Husband 1 Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
33	1890		2	1	1		{ Husband 1844 Wife 1843	1 1	1 1	—	—	
34	1890	1862					{ Husband and Wife 1830	1 1	—	—	—	
35	1890		—	—	—		{ Husband 1 Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
36	1894						{ Husband Wife	1 1	—	—	—	
37	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
38	1890	1876	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1849	6 4	1 1	5 3	—	Mother's half brother
39	1890						{ Husband 1849 Wife	1 1	—	—	—	2 second cousins (Wife No 3450 Husb No 2349)
40	1890	1851					{ Husband Wife 1814	1 1	1 1	—	—	3 cousins
41	1893	1867	7 or 8	—	all	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1848	1 7 8	1 1	— 7 8	—	
42	1890						{ Husband 1840 Wife	1 1	—	—	—	
43	1892	1891					{ Husband 1867 Wife 1865	5 4	2 1	3 3	—	
44	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1808 Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
45	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	
46	1893						{ Husband Wife	1 1	—	—	—	
47	1893						{ Husband 1845 Wife	1 1	—	—	—	
48	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife	1 7	1 2	— 5	—	
49	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1868	9 10	1 1	8 9	—	
50	1890	1874	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1857	9 5	2 1	7 4	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
26	{ B		Hartford Hartford	Died 1884
27	{ 1	Whooping cough	O & W Pa O & W Pa	
28	{ 4 B	Fall	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Husband No 1054
29	{ 3	Scarlet fever	N Y	Sister of Husb No 2250
30	{ B B		Ohio Ohio	First marriage, second to Wife No 331 Died 1890
31	{ B B		Ohio Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 430
32	{			
33	{ 2 12	Scarlet fever Brain fever	Ill Ill	
34	{ — 2	Measles	Ind	Not deaf
35	{ Inf			
36	{		N Y	Died 1894
37	{ B		W Pa	Died two weeks after marriage
38	{ Inf B	Sickness	Ohio Ohio	
39	{ 1	Gathering in head	N Y & Coll	
40	{	Sickness	C N Y N Y	Second marriage, first to Husband No 437
41	{ 4	Sickness	—	
42	{ 17 —	Brain fever	N Y & Coll	Not deaf
43	{ 2 12	Disch'ge from ear Scarlet fever and diphtheria	C N Y C N Y & W N Y	Parents first cousins Second marriage, first to Husb No 863 Parents second cousins.
44	{ 2	Cold	Ohio	Died 1873-4 Second marriage, first to Husb. No 1220 Not at school
45	{	Brain fever and spinal affection	N C	
46	{		N Y.	Dead
47	{ 3	Scarlet fever	Hartford	
48	{ 2 Inf	Scarlet fever	W Va Va	
49	{ 4 5	Cerebro-sp men. Cerebro-sp men	Kans Kans	
50	{ B 5	Brain fever . . .	Cal. & Oregon Oregon. . . .	Parents cousins.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.	
351	1890		3	—	3	—	(Husband 1853 Wife )	1 1	1 1			
352	1892	1890	1	—	—	1	(Husband 1864 Wife )	7 5	2 1	5 4	—	—
353	1891	1890	2	—	2	—	(Husband 1867 Wife )	9 8	1 1	8 7	—	—
354	1890	1889	2	—	2	—	(Husband 1838 Wife )	4 8	2 2	2 6	—	—
355	1891						(Husband Wife )	1 1	1 1			
356	1893	1890	2	—	2	—	(Husband 1870 Wife )	1 3	1 1	2 2	—	Great-aunt
357	1890	1870	8	3	5	—	(Husband 1848 Wife )	4 10	2 4	2 6	—	4 cousins Father (Husb No 2368), Grandfather (Husb No 2370), 5 cousins (including Husb No 2368 and Wife No 533 5 uncles and nephews (including Wif No 1998 and Wife No 3529)
358	1890	1864	2	—	2	—	(Husband 1828 Wife )	6	4	2	—	
359	1890						(Husband Wife )	1 1	1 1			—
360	1891	1870	2	—	2	—	(Husband Wife )	1849 2	2 2			
361	1893	1693	1	—	—	1	(Husband 1862 Wife )	3 10	2 2	1 8	—	—
362	1890	1884	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1850 Wife )	5 4	1 —	4 4	—	—
363	1890	1880	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1861 Wife )	1 2	1 1	1 1	—	Parents (No 2434), uncle (Husb No 3386), aunt (Wife No 29), cousin (Husb No 3547 is one)
364	1894	1891	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1861 Wife )	1 6	1 2	4 4	—	—
365	1891	1891	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1856 Wife )	10 7	1 1	9 6	—	—
366	1894	1880	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1857 Wife )	2 11	1 2	1 9	—	—
367	1891	1890	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1864 Wife )	7 3	2 1	5 2	—	—
368	1894	1889	2	—	1	1	(Husband 1863 Wife )	3 4	1 1	2 3	—	—
369	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1856 Wife )	3 1	1 1	2 —	—	—
370	1891	1890					(Husband 1862 Wife )	3 1	2 1	1 —	—	—
371	1893		3	3			(Husband Wife )	3 3	3 3			
372	1890	1858	4	—	4	—	(Husband 1831 Wife )	4 9	1 1	3 8	—	—
373	1890	1875	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1849 Wife )	3 6	1 2	2 4	—	—
374	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	(Husband 1829 Wife )	11 7	1 2	10 1	4	—
375	1892						(Husband 1860 Wife )	3 7	1 2	— 5	2	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
351	{		Wis Wis	Died 1893
352	{ 8 1½	Cerebro-sp men Teething	In 1 & College Ind	
353	{ 4 3	Spotted fever Typhoid fever	Ohio Ohio	
354	{ 5 B	Colds	Va Va	Parents first cousins Parents second cousins
355	{ —	—	La	Not deaf
356	{ 11½ 1½	Brain fever Spinal meningitis	N Y N Y	
357	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Sister of Husband No 2363 and Husband No 2365
358	{ B —		Hartford	Brother of Wife No 1320 Died 1871 Not deaf Died 1870
359	{ B —		N C	Not deaf
360	{ — B		N Y	Not deaf First marriage second to a hearing woman Parents fourth cousins Dead
361	{ B 1½	Measles	Ohio Ohio	
362	{ B —		La	Not deaf
363	{ 1½ 2	Sores Whooping cough.	Ohio Ohio	First marriage second to Wife No 364 Divorced 1890 First marriage second to Husband No 4097
364	{ 1 2	Sores	Ohio Ky	Second marriage first to Wife No 363 Sister of Wife No 1252
365	{ 9 8	Spotted fever Scarlet fever	Ind Ind	
366	{ 2½ 2	Scarlet fever Cold	Hartf'd & Coll Hartford	Sister of Husband No 2255
367	{ 1 2	Fits Sickness	Ohio Ohio	
368	{ 3 1½	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	La Miss	
369	{ B		Pa	
370	{ 1 1	Conges'n of brain Sickness	Ind Ohio	Parents cousins
371	{ —		—	Not deaf Mother of Wife No 3685
372	{ 1½ 2	Scarlet fever Fright at bark of dog	Va Pa	
373	{ 6½ 12	Scarlet fever Measles	Hartf'd & Coll Hartford	Died 1879 Sister of Husband No 1195
374	{ 5 B	Sickness & chills	Va Va	Parents third cousins
375	{ 3 B	Brain fever	Ind. Ind.	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES						PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE						
Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
376	1890						(Husband 1818 Wife 1822	1 1 1 1				
377	1892	1889	—	—	—		(Husband 1866 Wife 1867	1 1 8 1	7	—	—	—
378	1890						(Husband 1805 Wife	8 2 6	—			
379	1890	1	—	1	—		(Husband 1844 Wife 1850	1 1 4 3	1	—	—	—
380	1891	4	—	4	—		(Husband 1843 Wife 1845	1 1 2 2			Second cousin	
381	1891	1891	—	—	—		(Husband 1861 Wife 1870	3 1 8 1	2 7	—	—	—
382	1892	1891					(Husband 1879 Wife 1870	4 1 9 1	3 8	—	5 cousins (including Husb No 456 Husb No 378, Wife No 3865, and Wife No 3786)	
383	1892	1892	—	—	—		(Husband 1863 Wife 1871	7 1 1 1	6	—	—	—
384	1894	1892	1		1		(Husband 1863 Wife 1870	7 1 1 1	6	—	—	—
385	1890	1877					(Husband 1840 Wife 1860	1 1 1 1			—	—
386	1890						(Husband 1814 Wife 1803	8 1 7 5	7 2	—	11 other relatives	
387	1890	1861					(Husband 1838 Wife 1838	8 3 6 1	5 5	—	—	—
388	1890	1877	3		3		(Husband 1848 Wife 1856	6 1 3 1	5 2	—	—	—
389	1890	—	—	—	—		(Husband Wife 1819	1 1 4 1	3	—	2 uncles, 2 aunts	
390	1893	1892					(Husband 1858 Wife 1866	1 1 2 1	1	—	—	—
391	1890	1866	2	—	2		(Husband 1838 Wife	5 1 5 1	4	—	—	—
392	1890						(Husband 1803 Wife	1 1				
393	1890						(Husband 1815 Wife	4 4			2 cousins	
394	1890	1883	1	—	1		(Husband 1855 Wife 1862	5 1 5 1	4 4	—	—	—
395	1890	1890	3	—	3		(Husband 1858 Wife 1861	5 1 5 1	4 4	—	—	—
396	1890	1	—	1	—		(Husband 1851 Wife 1853	1 1 1 1			.....	.....
397	1893	3	—	3	—		(Husband 1840 Wife	1 1 1 1			.....	.....
398	1892	1	—	1	—		(Husb... Wife....	1 1 1 1			.....	.....
399	1892	6	—	6	—		(Husband 1838 Wife	1 1 1 1			.....	.....
400	1890	2	—	2	—		(Husband 1837 Wife 1844	4 3 1 1	1	—	.....	.....
401	1890	5	—	5	—		(Husband 1848 Wife 1846	1 1 1 1			.....	.....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
376	{ 2 1 1/2	Sickness Sickness	N Y N Y	
377	{ 2 7	Measles Spinal meningitis	Ind Ind	Died 1892 First marriage, second to Husb No 3937
378	{ 12 —	Typhus fever —	Hartford —	Not deaf
379	{ B —	— —	Ill Ill	Dead First marriage, second to Husb No 492 Sister of Husb No 1984 and Husb No 1951
380	{ 2 B	Dropsey on brain —	Ill Ill	Dead Probably second marriage, first to Husb No 1793 Sister of Husb No 804 Parents third cousins
381	{ B 1	— sickness	Pa Pa	Parents second cousins
382	{ 3 2 1/2	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Ohio Ohio	
383	{ 4 B	Brain fever —	Pa Pa	
384	{ 4 2	Brain fever Spotted fever	Ind & Ill Ind	
385	{ 2 4	Scarlet fever Spotted fever	Ill. and Ia Ia	
386	{ 1 B	Spotted fever —	Hartford Hartford	
387	{ B 2 1/2	Cholera morbus —	Hartford Hartford	
388	{ 12 2	"Winter fever" Scarlet fever	Miss and La Miss	
389	{ B —	— —	Ill —	Parents cousins Dead
390	{ 7 —	Cerebro-sp men —	N Y —	Hard of hearing
391	{ 4 —	Canker rash —	Hartford —	Not deaf
392	{ 2 1/2 —	Illness —	Hartford —	Not deaf
393	{ B —	— —	Hartford —	Dead
394	{ 3 1 1/2	Scarlet fever Fev & abscesses in head.	Hartford Hartford	Died 1887.
395	{ 5 2	Ty'd & brain fev Scarlet fever	Ind Wis	
396	{ 2 B	Measles. —	Kendall. Mich	
397	{ B —	— —	Ill —	
398	{ —	..... —	— —	
399	{ —	..... —	Eng —	Died 1892 Not deaf
	{ B B	..... .....	Hartford. Hartford ...	Brother of Wife No. 262 and Wife No 3745 Dead.



MARRIAGES					PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE							
Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
402	1890						(Husb Wife)	1	1			
403	1890				6		(Husband Wife)	5	2	3		Cousins uncle aunt
404	1890 1889	1				1	(Husband Wife)	1886 1884	1 1	1 1		— —
405	1890						(Husband Wife)	1849	1 1	1 1		
406	1890	2			2		(Husband Wife)	1871 1868	10 1	7 3		2 cousins
407	1890	3					(Husband Wife)	1871 1862	1 1	1 1		
408	1893 1893						(Husband Wife)	1868	2 1	2 1		1 cousin
409	1890 1867	1			3		(Husband Wife)	1842 1847	12 8	11 7		— — — —
410	1892 1891	1				1	(Husband Wife)	1870	3 2	3 2		Father (Husb No 1866) aunt
411	1891 1891						(Husband Wife)	1869	3 2	3 2		Father (Husb No 1866), aunt
412	1890 1884						(Husband Wife)	1886 1888	1 6	1 3		Parents (No 2600) 2 cousins (Wife No 746 and Husb No 3231) uncle (Husb No 3232) aunt (Wife No 3232)
413	1890	1				1	(Husband Wife)	1825	1 1	1 1		
414	1893 1892	1				1	(Husband Wife)	1864 1872	5 9	1 3	4 6	— — — —
415	1893 1892	1				1	(Husband Wife)	1866 1863	4 1	2 1	2 —	— — — —
416	1890						(Husband Wife)	1858	1 —	1 —		— —
417	1890						(Husband Wife)	1809	4 1	1 1	3 —	
418	1891 1883						(Husband Wife)	1820	1 1	1 1		
419	1892 1891	2				2	(Husband Wife)		1 1	1 1		
420	1892 1874	4			4		(Husband Wife)	1846 1852	3 5	1 2	2 3	Parents (No 3700), great-grandfather (Husb No 507), grandmother (Wife No 3696), great uncle (Husb No 511), 2 uncles (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 1723), 4 cousins (Wife No 4175, Husb No 3697, Husb No 514), 1 niece
421	1890						(Husband Wife)	1806	8	2	6	6 grandnephews and nieces, nephew, 2 nieces (Wife No 7 and Wife No 162)
422	1892 1876						(Husband Wife)	1805 1819	8 1	2 1	6 1	6 grandnephews and nieces, nephew, 2 nieces (Wife No 7 and Wife No 162)
423	1891 1884						(Husband Wife)	1869 1861	2 4	1 1	1 3	— — — —
424	1892 1889	1			1		(Husband Wife)	1865 1860	7	2	5	— —

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

11

## ARTNERS IN MARRIAGES.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
402	{			
403	{ B		— —	Parents cousins Died 1885
	{ —		— —	Not deaf
404	{ 19	Brain fever	Ia	
	{ 2		Ia	
405	{ 2	Scarlet fever	Ind	
	{ —			
406	{ B		N C	
	{ 14	Meningitis	N C	
407	{ 2	Pneumonia	Ill	
	{ B		Ill	
408	{ B		Ia.	
	{ —		Ia	
409	{ 1 1/2	Spasms	Ill	
	{ 2	Congestive fever	Ill	
410	{ 4	Risings in head	Miss	Brother of Husb No 411
	{ —		— —	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 411
411	{ B		Miss	Brother of Husb No 410
	{ —		— —	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 410
412	{ 2	Sting of bees	Ia	
	{ B		Kans	Dead
413	{		N C	
	{ —			
414	{ B		Ind and Ill	
	{ B		W N Y	Sister of Wife No 1647
415	{ 1 1/2	Spasms	Id	
	{ 1 1/2	Fall	N Y Impr d	
416	{	Scarlet fever	Kendall	
	{ —		— —	Not deaf
417	{ B		Hartford	
	{ —		— —	Uneducated
418	{ 3	Gather g in head	N Y	
	{ —		N Y	
419	{			
	{ —			
420	{ B		Hartford	Died 1892
	{ 2	Measles	Hartford	Sister of Wife No 3474
421	{ B		Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 422 Brother of Wife
	{ —		— —	No 2421. Died 1890
	{ —		— —	Not deaf Died 1875
422	{ B		Hartford	Second marriage first to Wife No 421 Brother of Wife
	{ 3	Inflam in head	N Y	No 2421. Died 1880
	{ —			Second marriage, first to Husb No 559 Died 1892
423	{ 3	Pneumonia	Ga	Died 1887
	{ B		Ga	
424	{ B			
	{ —		— —	Not deaf

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)			
Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children			Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per- son recorded)				
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing		Unknown	Total	Deaf		Hearing
425	1892	1891				(Husband 1868 { Wife	1	1			.....
426	1892					(Husband { Wife	2 3	1 1	1 —	— 2	2 grandnephews or nieces
427	1891	1			1	(Husband { Wife	1	1			
428	1890	1881	—	—	—	(Husband 1854 { Wife 1856	2 3	1 1	1 2	— —	
429	1894	1894	—	—	—	(Husband 1854 { Wife 1872	6 9	3 3	3 6	— —	Third cousin
430	1892	2	—	—	2	(Husband 1840 { Wife 1858	6 1	3 1	3 —	— —	
431	1890					(Husband 1816 { Wife 1811	3 3	3 3			..
432	1890	1848	7	—	7	(Husband 1823 { Wife	8 5	1 —	7 5	— —	
433	1890	1877	—	—	—	(Husband 1823 { Wife 1838	8 6	1 1	7 5	— —	
434	1891	1			1	(Husband { Wife 1854	7	1	6	—	
435	1893	1893	—	—	—	(Husband 1866 { Wife 1871	1 3	1 2		1	Mother (Wife No 1764)
436	1890	1886	1	—	1	(Husband 1861 { Wife 1860	10 5	1 1	9 4	— —	
437	1893	1	—	—	1	(Husband { Wife	1 3	1 1	— 2	—	
438	1890					(Husband 1856 { Wife 1864	1 1	1 1			
439	1890					(Husband 1797 { Wife	1	1			
440	1892	5	—	—	5	(Husband 1815 { Wife 1824	9 1	1 1	8 —	— —	
441	1892					(Husband 1815 { Wife	9	1	8	—	
442	1892	1	1			(Husband 1828 { Wife 1837	2 2	2 1	— 1	—	Uncle Father (Husb No 2260), uncle, 2 nephews or nieces
443	1892	1892	—	—	—	(Husband 1869 { Wife 1870	3 5	1 2	2 3	— —	3 fourth cousins (one is Wife No 82)
444	1891	1855	5	—	5	(Husband 1827 { Wife 1828	1 1	1 1			
445	1890					(Husband 1838 { Wife	1 2	1 2			1 second cousin
446	1890					(Husband 1822 { Wife	2 1	2 1			2 cousins (Husb No 233 & Wife No 2425 .....
447	1890	3	—	—	3	(Husband 1858 { Wife	1	1			
448	1891	1892	—	—	—	(Husband 1850 { Wife 1863	5 4	1 1	4 3	— —	
449	1891	1891	1		1	(Husband 1870 { Wife 1866	7 1	1 1	6 —	— —	
450	1890					(Husband 1852 { Wife 1862	1 1	1 1			... ..

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
425 {	2		Clarke	Parents cousins
426 {				
427 {			Pa	
428 {	2	Sores in the head	Hartford	
	2	Sores in the head	Hartford	
429 {	1 1/2	Rising in head	Texas	Brother of Husb No 430
	1	Parache	Texas	Sister of Wife No 509
430 {	1	Sickness	Texas	Brother of Husb No 429
	1 1/2	Rising in head	Texas	
431 {	B		N Y	
	B		N Y	Sister of Wife No 714
432 {	1 1/2	Whooping cough.	Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 414
				Not deaf
433 {	1 1/2	Whooping cough	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 432
	1	Fall and sickness	N Y	
434 {	Inf	Injury to spinal cord	W N Y	Not deaf
435 {	1 1/2	Spotted fever	Ind	
	1 1/2		Ind	
436 {	4	Scarlet fever	N C	
	B		N C	Parents cousins
437 {	19			
	3	Brain fever	Mich	
438 {	3	Scarlet fever	Ill	
	B		Ill	
439 {	B		N Y	Dead
440 {	14 1/2	Fever	Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 441 Died 1892.
	8			
441 {	14 1/2	Fever	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 440 Died 1892
				Not deaf Died 1890
442 {	B		N Y	Brother of Wife No 4275
	B		N Y	First marriage, second to Husb No 5290
443 {	B		Pa	
	2	Spotted fever	Pa	
444 {	B		Mich	
	B		N Y	
445 {	B		N Y	
	2 1/2	Inflam'n in head	N Y	
446 {	B		N Y	
	B		N Y	
447 {	15	Fall	Ga	Not deaf
448 {	2	"Ear rising"	N C & Coll.	
	1 1/2	Spinal meningitis	N. C	
449 {	1 1/2	Spinal meningitis	Minn	
	1 1/2	Spinal meningitis	Minn	
450 {	B		Ind.	
	2 1/2	Lung fever..	Ind.	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
451	1890	1871	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1846	6 5	1 1	5 4	—	—
452	1891	1866	5	4	1	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1843 sev	5 4 sev	1 4	4 sev	—	.
453	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1			.
454	1890	1800	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1868	4 5	1 1	3 4	—	—
455	1890						{ Husband 1841 Wife .	1 1	1			—
456	1890	1800	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife	1 1	1			—
457	1892		2	1	—	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1865	3 2	3 2	—	—	Grandmother . . .
458	1892	1873	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1855	1 5	1 1	4 —	—	—
459	1880	1879	4	4	—	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1856	4 4	3 2	3 2	—	
460	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1			
461	1890						{ Husband Wife 1821	3 3	1 1	2 —	—	
462	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1833	4 7	1 1	3 6	—	
463	1890						{ Husband 1825 Wife	1 1	1			
464	1892	1853	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife 1821	6 7	1 2	5 5	—	—
465	1892	1806					{ Husband 1828 Wife 1838	4 3	2 1	2 2	—	.
466	1892	1800					{ Husband 1828 Wife 1837	4 5	2 1	2 4	—	
467	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1873 Wife	2 1	1 1	1 —	—	— . . .
468	1893		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife	1 1	1			.
469	1890	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1865	6 6	1 2	5 4	—	..
470	1891						{ Husband Wife 1863	1 4	1 1	3 —	—	—
471	1890	1880	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1868	1 1	1 1			. . .
472	1892		1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1869 Wife	1 1	1			. . . .
473	1890						{ Husband Wife 1849	1 1	1			. .
474	1893		2	. . .	2		{ Husband 1868 Wife 1863	9 4	1 1	8 3	—	—
475	1892						{ Husband Wife .	1 1	1			
476	1890						{ Husband 1849 Wife 1856	1 2	1 2			. . . . .

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Case number,	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
	3	Scarlet fever	Tenn	
	1	Meningitis	Ky & Tenn	
	1	Sickness	Ill	Parents 4th cousins. Sister of Husb No 1822 and Husb
	3	Scarlet fever	Ill	No 1821
	—	—	—	Not deaf Died 1873
	—	—	Hartford	
	1	Sickness	Pa	
	5	Typhoid fever	Pa	
	—	A fall	Ala	
	2	Cong'n of brain	Mich	
	B	—	N Y	Sister of Wife No 3017
	B	—	N Y	
	B	Brain fever	N Y	Died 1892
	1 1/2	Scarlet fever	Mich	
	B	—	N. Y	Brother of Wife No 3191
	1 1/2	—	N Y	Sister of Husb No 1080
	—	—	—	Not deaf
	—	—	—	Second marriage
	—	—	—	Not deaf
	8	Fever	Hartford	
	1 1/2	Scarlet fever	Hartford	
	B	—	Hartford	
	1	Measles	N Y	
	1 1/2	Illness	Hartford	Died 1892
	B	—	Hartford	
	B	Spasmodic cough	Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 466 Died 1892.
	1 1/2	—	Hartford	
	B	Scarlet fever	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 485 Died 1892
	2	—	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Husb No 2650, third to Husb
	8	Cold	Ind	No 1301 Died 1893
	—	—	Ind	
	—	—	N Y	
	14	Cold	W Va	
	2	Diphtheria	W Va	Sister of Wife No 1389
	—	—	La	
	1 1/2	Fall	Miss	Second marriage, first to Husb No 2604
	2	Fever	Ill	
	3	Scrofula	Neb & Ia	
	—	Spinal fever	Ia	
	—	—	—	Not deaf
	1 1/2	Fever	Ill	
	3	Scarlet fever	N Y	
	3	Convulsions	Hartford	
	—	—	Scotland.	
	2	Scrofula	Ind	Sister of Husb. No 3663
	—	—	Ind.	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
477	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1861 { Wife 1861	1 1 6 1	—	5	—	
478	1891						{ Husband 1848 { Wife 1862	1 1 2 1	—	—	1	
479	1890						{ Husband 1862 { Wife 1862	1 1 1 1				
480	1893 1893		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 { Wife 1862	1 1 1 1				
481	1890 1887	1	—	—	1	—	{ Husband 1851 { Wife 1868	7 1 2 1	6 1	—	—	Parents (No 4111), 3 uncles (including Husb No 4113 and Husb No 4114), 4 cousins
482	1890						{ Husband 1836 { Wife 1862	1 1 —				
483	1890 1872						{ Husband 1850 { Wife 1851	1 1 7 2	—	5	—	Cousin, mother partially
484	1890 1889						{ Husband 1850 { Wife 1859	1 1 3 2	—	1	—	
485	1890	2	—	—	2	—	{ Husband 1850 { Wife 1850	1 1 3 3				
486	1891						{ Husband 1850 { Wife 1850	1 1 —				
487	1890	REV	—	—	REV	—	{ Husband 1860 { Wife 1860	5 1 —	4	—	—	
488	1890 1867						{ Husband 1834 { Wife 1844	4 1 2 1	3 1	—	—	
489	1890 1867	4	—	—	4	—	{ Husband 1838 { Wife 1837	8 1 8 1	7 7	—	—	
490	1890 1879	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1845 { Wife 1836	5 1 5 1	4 1	—	—	
491	1890						{ Husband 1851 { Wife 1851	1 1 1 1				
492	1891 1888	1			1	—	{ Husband 1842 { Wife 1850	1 1 4 3	—	1	—	
493	1893	2			2	—	{ Husband 1868 { Wife 1868	3 1 —	2	—	—	
494	1892						{ Husband 1843 { Wife 1861	1 1 10 1	—	—	—	
495	1890 1881	5	—	—	5	—	{ Husband 1843 { Wife 1861	1 1 10 1	—	9	—	
496	1894 1890	2	—	—	2	—	{ Husband 1867 { Wife 1868	1 1 1 1				
497	1894 1889	2			2	—	{ Husband 1858 { Wife 1867	1 1 3 2	—	1	—	
498	1893 1885	1	—	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 { Wife 1868	12 1 4 1	11 3	—	—	
499	1891						{ Husband 1824 { Wife 1863	1 1 5 2	—	3	—	
500	1890						{ Husband 1863 { Wife 1863	6 1 6 1	—	5	—	
501	1890	2	—	—	2	—	{ Husband 1813 { Wife 1809	1 1 1 1				

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
177	B	.	Mich	
178	3	.	Wis	
179	12	Fall	W. Va	Not deaf.
180	3 B	Spotted fever	Ind Ind	
181	8 B	Inflam of brain	Ia Oregon	Parents cousins
182	12½	Scarlet fever	N Y	
183	B 3	A Fall ..	N Y N Y	First marriage; second to Wife No 484. Died 1873.
184	B 3	Whooping cough	N Y N Y & W N Y	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 483
185	Inf	Brain fever		
186				
187	5	Scrofula	Mich	Not deaf
188	1	Disease in head Fall	Hartford Hartford	
189	3 12	Sores in head Inflam in head	Hartford Hartford	Died 1889
190	2 (2½)	Scarlet fever Ulcers in ears	Hartford Hartford.	Deserted his wife 1887 Became blind
191	1½	Scarlet fever	Ind . ...	
192	4 B	Measles	Ill Ill	Second marriage, first to Husb No. 379 Sister of Husb No 1984 and Husb No 1953
193	12½	Scar fev, cong'n of brain, and whoop'g cough.	N Y	
194	4	Scarlet fever	Ind. ....	First marriage; second to Wife No 495
195	4 12	Scarlet fever Cong'n of brain	Ind Kans	Second marriage, first to Wife No 494.
196	6 2	Spotted fever Sores in the head	Ohio Ohio	
197	7 B	Scarlet fever	N Y ..... N. Y. ..	
198	2 14	Meningitis ..... Brain fever ....	Ga. Ga.	
199		Sickness ...	N. Y ..... .....	Died 1867.
200	B 1½	Cerebro-sp men	Hartford .... H'fd, H. Mann, Clarke	Deserted his wife, Bro of Husb No. 505. Second marriage, first to Husb. No. 2910.
201	7 B	Disease in head .....	Hartford. .... Pa. ....	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES					PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)		
	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children			Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)					
			Total	Deaf			Hearing.	Unknown	Total		Deaf	Hearing
502	1891		1			1	{ Husband 1838 Wife	1 1 1 1				
503	1894 1892		1		1		{ Husband 1862 Wife 1865	rev 10 1 9	rev			
504	1890	rev			all		{ Husband 1827 Wife	1 1 —				
505	1892 1892						{ Husband 1862 Wife 1870	5 2 2 1	3 1			
506	1890		2	1	1		{ Husband Wife	8 2 —	6			Uncle (Husb No 4083), cousin nephew
507	1890		2	2			{ Husband 1772 Wife	1 1 —				
508	1890						{ Husband 1855 Wife 1861	1 1 1 1				Aunt
509	1890		2		2		{ Husband 1832 Wife	4 2 —	2			Five remote relatives
510	1891 1873		1		1		{ Husband 1848 Wife 1852	1 1 5 1	4			
511	1890 1832		2	1	1		{ Husband 1804 Wife 1811	2 2 10 2	8			Father (Husb No 507), 2 nephews (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 3700), Cousins, nephew or niece
512	1890 1864						{ Husband 1804 Wife	2 2 10 4	5 1			Father (Husb No 507), 2 nephews (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 3700)
513	1890						{ Husband 1863 Wife 1858	1 1 2 2				
							{ Husband 1839	2 1	1			Grandfather (Husb No 507), parents (No 511), 2 aunts (Wife No 3696 and Wife No 2623), 2 cousins (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 3700), 2 second cousins (Wife No 420 and Wife No 3474)
514	1890 1866		1		1		{ Husband 1839 Wife	2 1 —	1			Grandfather (Husb No 507), parents (No 511), 2 aunts (Wife No 3696 and Wife No 2623), 2 cousins (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 3700), 2 second cousins (Wife No 420 and Wife No 3474).
515	1890 1876						{ Husband 1839 Wife	2 1 —	1			Grandfather (Husb No 507), parents (No 511), 2 aunts (Wife No 3696 and Wife No 2623), 2 cousins (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 3700), 2 second cousins (Wife No 420 and Wife No 3474).
516	1890 1888						{ Husband 1839 Wife	2 1 —	1			Grandfather (Husb No 507), parents (No 511), 2 aunts (Wife No 3696 and Wife No 2623), 2 cousins (Husb No 3698 and Husb No 3700), 2 second cousins (Wife No 420 and Wife No 3474).
517	1891 1891		1			1	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1869	1 1 1 1				
518	1892						{ Husband Wife	1 1 —				
519	1890		3			3	{ Husband Wife	1 1 1 1				
520	1890						{ Husband 1842 Wife 1846	1 1 1 1				
521	1892 1892						{ Husband 1859 Wife 1867	2 1 2 1	1 1 1 1			

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

179

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
502	2	Measles	N Y	
503	2 (1)	Affec'n of brain Lung fever	Ohio Ohio	
504	B	—	Ill	Not deaf
505	B 2	Measles	Hartford Hartford	Brother of Husb No 500
506	—	—	—	Not deaf Uneducated First marriage, second to Husb No 74 Sister of Husb No 3229 Mother of Wife No 3465
507	B	—	—	Not deaf Mother of Wife No 3096 and Husb No 511.
508	B 2	Scarlet fever	Ia Ia	
509	B	—	Hartford	Not deaf
510	4	Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Separated
511	B	—	Hartford	First marriage second to Wife No 512 Brother of Wife No 3696 Died 1886
	B	—	Hartford	Mother of Husb No 514 Sis of Wife No 2623 Died 1862
512	B	—	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 511 Brother of Wife No 3696 Died 1886
	—	—	—	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 677, Husb No 676, Husb, No 697, Wife No 678 Died 1889
513	B	—	Ill Ill	Parents cousins Sister of Wife No 737
	B	—	Hartford	Divorced First marriage, second to Wife No 515, third to Wife No 516
514	—	—	—	Not deaf.
	B	—	Hartford.	Second marriage, first to Wife No 514, third to Wife No. 516
515	—	—	—	Not deaf Died 1885
	B	—	Hartford	Third marriage, first to Wife No 514, second to Wife No 515.
516	—	—	—	Not deaf
517	16 (4)	Typhus fever Spital disease.	N Y St Joseph's (N Y)	
518	—	—	Neb	Died 1891
519	—	—	Tenn	Died 1890
520	11½ (B)	Gather'g in head	Ill Ill	...
521	B (4)	Scarlet fever.	Va & Kendall. Va.	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES.							PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.						
Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No. of Children.			Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]		
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing		Unknown	Total	Deaf	Hearing.		Unknown.	
522	1893		5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	9 3 6 1 1	—	Father partially, second cousins, nieces (Wife No. 2727)			
528	1893	1892	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1864	4 1 3 1 1	—				
524	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1850 sev. Wife 1851	7 1 sev. 3 3 4	—				
525	1891	1883	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1860	1 1 5 1 4	—				
526	1892			—		—	{ Husband Wife	1851 1 1	—				
527	1891	1877	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1855	1 1 4 1 3	—				
528	1893	1892	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1870 Wife 1876	6 1 5 4 1 3	—				
529	1894	1893	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1868	6 1 5 5 1 4	—				
530	1892	1891	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1 2 2	—				
531	1891	1874		—		—	{ Husband 1845 Wife	1 1 5 1 4	—				
532	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1862	8 1 7 2 1 1	—				
533	1890	1876	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1836	8 1 7 4 3 1	—	Father (Husb No 236), uncle, cousins (including Husb No 2370, Husb No 2367, Husb No 2363, Wife No 357, Wife No 1994, Wife No 3329)			
534	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1822	8 2 6 1 1	—				
535	1891	1869	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife	1 1 2 2	—				
536	1891	1873	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1834	7 3 4 10 — 10	—	4 cousins (including Husb. No 2948 Wife No 2526), nephew, uncle and aunts hard of hearing Aunt and second cousin (Husb No 536)			
537	1890	1867	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife	9 1 8 —	—				
538	1890		3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1860 Wife	10 2 8 —	—				
539	1890	sev	—	sev.	—	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife	1 1 —	—				
540	1894	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1857	1 1 5 1 4	—				
541	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1810 Wife	2 1 1 —	—				
542	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife	1 1 —	—				
543	1890	1876	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1851	14 4 10 3 1 2	—				
544	1892		4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1820 Wife 1821	1 1 1 1	—				
545	1889		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1862	6 1 5 —	—				

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

181

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
22	{ —	—	—	Hard of hearing Brother of Wife No. 1175, Wife No. 820, and Wife No 3701
23	{ 1 1/4 1 1/4	Typhoid fever Brain fever	Ga Ill Ill	..
24	{ B	Over'die of quin'ie	Ala Ala	Sister of Husb No 2872 and Wife No 1883
25	{ 7 B	Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	..
26	{ 5	Scarlet fever	Ind	
27	{ 2	Scarlet fever	Is Is	Dead.
28	{ 14 5	Cerebro-sp men	Ohio	Educated in hearing schools.
29	{ 2 1 1/4	Spotted fever Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	
30	{		Aberdeen Aberdeen	
31	{ 5 2	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Pa Mich	..
32	{ 1 1/2 1		Kans Kans	
33	{ 6 B	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	.. Died 1885
34	{ Inf 2	Scarlet fever Fall	Hartford	
35	{ Inf B	"Nervous"	N Y N Y	Separated.
36	{ B	...	Va	Husband and wife are second cousins Three of the children hard of hearing
37	{ —	—	—	Not deaf
37	{ Inf	Ulcers in head	Hartford	..
38	{ B	—	N C	Brother of Wife No. 1767. Not deaf
39	{ 19	Scarlet fever	.....	Not deaf
40	{ 2 B	Scarlet fever	Whipp's & H'fd Hartford	Died 1894.
41	{ 3	Spotted fever	Hartford	.. Died 1865 Not deaf.
42	{ 6 1/4	Scarlet fever.	Clarke	Not deaf
43	{ 4	Fall	Hartford Hartford	Parents cousins Brother of Wife No. 868
44	{ 5 B	Fever	Canajoharie N Y	Died 1892. Dead.
45	{ 8	Scarlet fever	Pa	Died 1878.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES							PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.						
Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]	
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
546	1891	1887	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1867 1867	6 7	1 1	5 6	— —	
547	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1806 1806	6 1	1 —	5 —	—	
548	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1806 1807	6 1	1 1	5 —	—	
549	1892	1852	4	3	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1820 1820	6 10	1 4	5 6	—	3 cousins
550	1893	1892					{ Husband Wife	1857 1857	4 3	3 2	1 1	—	Parents (No 549), 2 uncles (Husb No. 1888 is one), aunt (Wife No 3063), 3 second cousins
551	1890	1809	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1843 1840	2 7	1 2	1 5	—	
552	1891						{ Husband Wife	1801 1801	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
553	1890	1865	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1806 1806	5 —	2 —	3 —	—	
554	1890	1883	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1858	2 —	2 —	— —	—	2 uncles (Husb No. 3792 and Husb No 1896)
555	1893	1875	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1851 1849	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
556	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1806 1806	7 —	2 —	5 —	—	
557	1890	1853					{ Husband Wife	1806 1827	7 7	2 1	5 6	—	
558	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1803 1803	10 —	3 —	7 —	—	Mother (Wife No 1911), uncle, 2 nieces (Wife No 2166 and Wife No 4336)
559	1892	1839	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1808 1819	11 1	1 1	10 —	—	
560	1892		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1819 1819	3 —	1 —	— —	2	
561	1891	1890					{ Husband Wife	1859 1872	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
562	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1864 1864	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
563	1892						{ Husband Wife	1863 1863	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
564	1891						{ Husband Wife	1812 1812	1 —	1 —	— —	—	
565	1890						{ Husband Wife	1845 1856	5 5	2 1	3 4	—	
566	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1856 1856	9 —	3 —	6 —	—	4 cousins (Husb No 180 is one)
567	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1872 1872	1 1	1 —	— —	—	Cousin
568	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1852 1867	1 1	1 —	— —	—	Cousin
569	1890	1868					{ Husband Wife	1828 1831	1 6	1 2	1 4	—	Uncle, 3 aunts (Wife No 2413 is one).
570	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1867 1866	1 4	1 1	— 3	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
546	{ —	—	Ga	Not deaf Parents 3d cousins Brother of Wife No 1090.
547	{ 1½	Fall	Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 548 Died 1851 Not deaf
548	{ 1½ B	Fall	Hartford Hartford.	Second marriage, first to Wife No 547 Died 1851 First marriage, second to Husb No 3883 Died 1860
549	{ 1½ B	Scarlet fever	Va. Va	Father of Husb No 550 Sister of Husb No 1888 and Wife No 3063
550	{ B	—	W Va	—
551	{ 7 B	Scarlet fever	Ill Ill	Second marriage, first to Husb. No 95 Sister of Wife No 163
552	{ —	—	Ohio	—
553	{ B	—	Va.	Brother of Wife No 3648 Not deaf
554	{ B	—	Ind	Died 1886 Hard of hearing
555	{ B B	—	Ga Ga	—
556	{ 2½	Spotted fever	Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 557 Died 1860 Not deaf
557	{ 2½ 1	Spotted fever Inflam of brain	Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 556 Died 1860 First marriage, second to Husb No 320
558	{ —	—	—	Not deaf First marriage; second to Husb No 4073 Sister of Wife No 86 and Wife No 4041 Uneducated.
559	{ 8 3	Brain fever Infl'n of the head	N Y	Died 1874 First marriage, second to Husb No 422. Died 1892
560	{ —	—	—	Dead
561	{ B 1	Spinal meningitis	Hartford Hartford	—
562	{ 6	—	Mo & St Louis Day	—
563	{ 6 B	Spinal meningitis	Mo. Mo	—
564	{ —	—	N. Y	—
565	{ B 1½	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Third marriage, 1st to Wife No 216; 2d to Wife No 206 Second marriage, first to Husb No 232.
566	{ B	—	Kans. & Mo	Not deaf Divorced. First marriage; second to Husb No 180 Sister of Husb No 1960
567	{ 1½	Exposure to cold.	Kendall	Not deaf
568	{ Inf 1½	Brain fever Brain fever	N. Y. N. Y.	—
569	{ B	—	N. Y N Y	Sister of Husb No. 3757
570	{ 1 B	Cerebro-sp men	Wis. Wis	—

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total.	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown.	
571	1892		5			5	{ Husband 1848 Wife	1	1			
572	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife	7	1	6	—	—
573	1893	1878	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1855	1 2	1 1	1	—	—
574	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1860	1 1	1 1			—
575	1893	1864	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1843	4 9	1 1	3 8	—	—
576	1890	1858	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife	6 6	2 1	4 5	—	—
577	1893		3	1	2	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1855	1 3	1 1	2	—	—
578	1890						{ Husband 1808 Wife	1	1			
579	1894	1889					{ Husband Wife 1869	6	2	4	—	
580	1894	1873					{ Husband 1844 Wife	1	1			
581	1894	1867					{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			
582	1894	1872					{ Husband 1841 Wife	1 1	1 1			
583	1894	1864					{ Husband 1847 Wife	1 1	1 1			
584	1894	1873					{ Husband Wife 1843	1 1	1 1			
585	1894						{ Husband Wife 1850	1 3	1 2	1	—	
586	1893		1			1	{ Husband Wife 1860	4	2	2	—	—
587	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1869 Wife 1873	1 5	1 1	4	—	—
588	1894	1893	1	..	..	1	{ Husband 1861 Wife	3 11	1 4	2 7	—	Father (Husb No. 602).
589	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1868	13 4	1 1	12 3	—	"Yes,"
590	1894	1893					{ Husband 1867 Wife 1865	2 6	1 1	1 5	—	—
591	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife 1870	3 6	3 1	5	—	—
592	1894	1893	1			1	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1870	1 1	1 1			..
593	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1869	3 7	3 1	6	—	..
594	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife 1867	2 1	1 1	1	—	—
595	1891		1			1	{ Husband 1858 Wife	4	1	3	—	—
596	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1867	1 6	1 1	5	—	—

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per son recorded.)				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.	
571	1892		5			5	{ Husband 1846 { Wife	1	1			
572	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 { Wife	7	1	6	—	—
573	1893	1878	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1853 { Wife 1855	1	1	1	—	—
574	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 { Wife 1860	1	1	1	—	—
575	1893	1864	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1843 { Wife 1843	4	1	3	—	—
576	1890	1858	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 { Wife	6	2	4	—	—
577	1893		3	1	2	—	{ Husband 1846 { Wife 1855	1	1	2	—	—
578	1890						{ Husband 1808 { Wife	1	1		—	—
579	1894	1889					{ Husband { Wife 1869	6	2	4	—	—
580	1894	1873					{ Husband 1844 { Wife	1	1		—	—
581	1894	1867					{ Husband { Wife	1	1		—	—
582	1894	1872					{ Husband 1841 { Wife	1	1	1	—	—
583	1894	1884					{ Husband 1847 { Wife	1	1	1	—	—
584	1894	1873					{ Husband { Wife 1843	1	1	1	—	—
585	1894						{ Husband { Wife 1850	1	1	3	1	—
586	1893		1			1	{ Husband { Wife 1860	4	2	2	—	—
587	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1869 { Wife 1873	1	1	4	—	—
588	1894	1893	1			1	{ Husband 1861 { Wife	3	1	2	—	Father (Husb No 602)
589	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 { Wife 1868	13	1	12	—	Yes
590	1894	1893					{ Husband 1867 { Wife 1863	2	1	1	—	—
591	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 { Wife 1870	3	1	5	—	—
592	1894	1893	1			1	{ Husband 1865 { Wife 1870	1	1	1	—	—
593	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866 { Wife 1869	3	3	6	—	—
594	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 { Wife 1867	2	1	1	—	—
595	1891		1			1	{ Husband 1858 { Wife	4	1	3	—	—
596	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 { Wife 1867	1	1	5	—	—



*Tabular Statement of Marriages.*

MARRIAGES							PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.						
Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)	
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
597	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1870	1 4	1 1	3 —	—	—	
598	1894		1			1	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1	3 1	1 1	2 —	—	—	
599	1895	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1869	9 9	1 1	8 6	—	Third cousin	
600	1895	1884					{ Husband Wife	1 1					
601	1895		1			1	{ Husband 1849 Wife	1 1	1 1			Granduncle	
602			3	1	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1					
603			2	2			{ Husband Wife	3 3					
604	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1873	5 2	1 1	4 —	—	Parents (No 2804), aunt (Wife No 3742), uncle	
605							{ Husband 1870 Wife					Nephew	
606	1891		1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1864	1 7	1 3		4	Parents (No 2918), uncle (Husb No 2919), 4 cousins (Husb No. 3095 is one)	
607	1891		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1863	1 1	1 1			—	
608	1890	1882	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1863	7 3	3 1	4 2	—	—	
609	1889		12	—	12	—	{ Husband 1816 Wife 1827	2 2	2 1		1	—	
610	1891	1843	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife 1819	2 3	2 3	—	—		
611	1889	1876	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1842	5 5	1 1	4 4	—	Distant cousin	
612	1893		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1827 Wife 1826	1 4	1 1		3	—	
613	1889	1887	1	1	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1867	5 9	1 9	4 —	—	9 cousins, 2 uncles, 1 aunt Parents (No 810), 3 uncles (Husb No 809 is one), third cousin, aunt	
614	1889	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife 1867	5 5	1 1	4 4	—	—	
615	1889	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1861	5 5	1 1	3 4	1	—	
616	1891	1885	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1834 Wife 1834	6 4	1 1	5 3	—	—	
617	1889	1876	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1832	9 11	1 3	8 8	—	—	
618	1893	1888	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1862	8 8	1 1	7 6	1	—	
619	1892	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1864	5 12	2 1	3 11	—	—	
620	1889	1877	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1845	10 7	1 3	9 4	—	—	
621	1893		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1836	1 1	1 1			—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
97	{ 3 11	Scarlet fever	Ia. & Coll Ia. & Coll	
98	{ 1½	Cold	Cal., O., & Kend'l Tenn	
99	{ 2½ 12	Fever Ear-ache	Texas Texas	Sister of Wife No 429
300	{ —	—	—	Probably not deaf
301	{ B	—	Kendall	
302	{ 4 —	—	—	Not deaf Mother of Husb No 588
303	{ —	—	—	Not deaf Mother of Wife No 1201 Became deranged
304	{ 6 5	Brain fever Croup	Ohio Ohio	
305	{ B	—	Ind	
306	{ 1½ 1½	Smallpox Whooping cough	Pa Pa	Sister of Wife No 2408 and Husb No 3094.
307	{ 2	Measles	N Y Imp'd	
308	{ 1½ 2	Scarlet fever Teething	Mo Mo	Brother of Wife No 1307
309	{ B B	—	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 610 Died 1888
310	{ B B	—	Pa N Y	Brother of Husb No 609 Died 1891 Sister of Wife No 840 and Wife No 3580
311	{ 14 9	Brain fever Brain fever	Ohio & Coll Mich	Died 1882
312	{ 1 1½	Gather'g in head	Pa Pa	Died 1868
313	{ 1½ B	Brain fever	Ark N C	Cousin of Wife First marriage, second to Wife No 801 Sister of Husb No 812, Husb No 811, Husb No 808, Wife No 3879 Died 1888
314	{ 7 B	Meningitis	Ark Ark	
315	{ 2½ 8	Scarlet fever. Scarlet fever.	R I. & H. M H M.	Separated
316	{ 5½ B	Scarlet fever ..	Pa Pa	Died 1892 Second marriage, first to Husb No 2918
317	{ 4 Inf	Measles Scarlet fever	Kendall Kendall	
318	{ 4 3	Typhoid fever. Paralysis	Le Conteuix Le Conteuix.	
319	{ 2 1½	Disease Scarlet fever	Pa & W Pa W Pa	Parents cousins Father deaf in adult life Died 1892 First marriage, second to Husb No 3213
320	{ 1½ 5	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Pa .... Pa . .	
321	{ 7 8	Colds . .... Disease ..	Pa Pa ....	Second marriage, first to Wife No 688

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES							PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE							Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children ]	
Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]							
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown				
622	1889	1872	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1847 1850	7 1	1 1	6	—	—		
623	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1	4 1	2 1	2	—	—		
624	1889	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1867	4 6	2 3	2 3	1 niece	—		
625	1890	1877	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1853 1857	16 8	1 2	15 6	—	—		
626	1889	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1861 1858	3 5	1 1	2 4	—	—		
627	1889	1877	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1850 1850	5 4	1 4	4	—	—		
628	1889	1869	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1835 1826	9 10	2 3	7 7	Parents (No 2904), 2 uncles, aunt (Wife No 3263)	—		
629	1889	1852	6	—	5	1	{ Husband Wife	1829 1833	8 10	2 3	6 7	Nephew and niece	—		
630	1889	1882	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1838 1840	7 6	1 2	6 4	—	—		
631	1890	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1861 1865	4 3	1 1	3 2	Cousin	—		
632	1891	1884	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife	1852 1863	11 6	1 1	10 5	—	—		
633	1889	1870	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1844 1839	3 7	1 1	2 6	—	—		
634	1889	1879	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1856	4 1	1 1	3	—	—		
635	1889	1864	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1840	7 4	— 1	7 3	—	—		
636	1890	—	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1856 1860	5 1	2 1	3	—	—		
637	1890	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1864	2 2	1 1	1	—	—		
638	1890	1883	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1857 1863	2 8	1 1	1 7	—	—		
639	1889	1883	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1857 1863	1 2	1 2	—	—	—		
640	1889	1877	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1851 1851	10 5	1 3	9 2	1 niece	—		
641	1891	1882	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1860	3 5	— 1	3 4	—	—		
642	1890	1877	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1849 1857	6 1	1 1	5	—	—		
643	1889	1888	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1859 1859	4 10	1 4	3 6	—	—		
644	1890	1858	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1827 1836	3 1	1 1	2	—	—		
645	1892	1888	2	—	—	2	{ Husband Wife	1863 1862	7 10	1 1	6 9	—	—		
646	1893	1889	2	—	—	2	{ Husband Wife	1864 1869	5 12	1 4	4 8	—	—		
647	1889	1877	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1834 1854	13 4	1 2	12	—	—		

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

189

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
22	{ B { 5	Pleurisy	Ark Ark	Dead Dead.
23	{ B { Inf	Measles	Cal	Brother of Wife No 2599 Married also to Wife No 897 and to Wife No 898
24	{ B { B		Neb & Coll Neb	Brother of Wife No 3110
25	{ 1 { B	Scarlet fever	Wis , Ill , Coll Cal	Sister of Wife No 2044 Died 1884
26	{ B { 3		Iowa Iowa	
27	{ 1 { B	Brain fever	N Y N Y	Abandoned his family Sister of Husb No 2906
28	{ B { 1	Whooping cough	N Y N Y	Second marriage, first to Husb No 1396 Sister of Wife No 621
29	{ B { B		N Y N Y	Brother of Wife No 2945 Sister of Wife No 628
30	{ 8 { J	Menigitis Measles and wh'g cough	Ohio Ohio	
31	{ 19 { B	Measles	Ind Ohio	
32	{ 11 { 6	Spotted fever Scarlet fever	Ohio Ohio	Died 1891
33	{ 5 { J	Scarlet fever Inflam in head	Ohio Ohio	
34	{ 2 { 2	Cold Brain fever	Ohio Ohio	
35	{ — {	Measles	Ohio	Not deaf
36	{ B { B		Ill Ill	Brother of Wife No 3139 Parents cousins Dead
37	{ 5 { Inf	Vaccination Fall	Ill Ill	Parents cousins
38	{ 1 { B	Measles	Ill & Kans Kans	
39	{ 2 { J	Diphtheria. Spotted fever	Kans Kans	
40	{ 2 { B	Sickness	Ohio & Mo Kans & Colo	Sister of Husb No 2948 and Wife No 1692
41	{ — { B	—	Kans	Not deaf Separated 1891
42	{ 4 { 13	Sc'let & b'n fevs Cold	Ill N Y & Ill	Died 1890
43	{ 1 { B	Scarlet fever ..	Mich Ill . . . .	Sister of Wife No 1656 and Husb. No. 1524
44	{ 7 { 7	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Hartford Ill	
45	{ 1 { 3	Spotted fever Conges'n of brain	Ill & Kans Kans	
46	{ B { B	. . . . ....	Le Conteux Le Conteux	Sister of Wife No. 2143.
47	{ J { B	Group ....	Kans & Ind. Kans . . . 4	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES.						PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.							
	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children.				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]		
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown			
648	1891	1866	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1830 Wife 1828	5 11	1 2	4 9	—	3 fourth cousins (one is Husb. No 1769)		
649	1890	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1843	7 7	1 1	6 6	—			
650	1889	1860	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1835	4 5	1 3	3 2	—	2 cousins (Husb No 3316 and Husb No 3317), 7 second cousins (including Husb No 3314, Wife No 2197, Wife No 3485, Wife No 3658, Husb. No 3415), nephew (Husb No 2775), also 1 third cousin		
651	1889	1863	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1838	4 1	1 1	3 —	—			
652	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1863	4 4	1 1	3 3	—	—		
653	1890	1879	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife	5 7	1 —	4 7	—			
654	1891	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1862	11 3	1 1	10 2	—	—		
655	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife	2	2		—			
656	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife	2	2		—	—		
657	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1812 Wife 1818	1 4	1 1	3 —	—			
658	1889	1880	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1863	6 15	1 1	5 14	—	6 cousins (Husb No 2221, Wife No 2244, Wife No 1153, Husb No 2222, Wife No 3313, included), 2 second cousins		
659	1891	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1850	3 8	1 1	2 7	—			
660	1889	1868	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1829	2 1	2 1		—	Cousin (Wife No. 2791)		
661	1889	1881	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1861	4 1	1 1	3 —	—			
662	1889	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1862	4 9	1 3	3 6	—	—		
663	1892	1885	3	—	1	2	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1862	10 8	1 1	9 7	—			
664	1889	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1874	5	1	4	—	—		
665	1890		2	2			{ Husband 1837 Wife 1842	4 3	1 2	3 1	—			
666	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife 1862	1 1	1 1		—	Cousin		
667	1889		5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife 1828	1 5	1 4	1 —	—			
668	1889	1872	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1842	1 1	1 1		—	—		
669	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1850	12 3	3 2	9 1	—			
670	1893		3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1861	1 2	1 1	1 —	—	—		
671	1889	1882	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1859	7 9	1 1	6 —	—			
												3 third cousins (Husb. No 692, Wife No 3155, Wife No 1486).		

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
148	{ B Inf	Sickness	Pa Pa	Died 1860 First marriage, second to Husb No 183
149	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Use of quinine Scarlet fever	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage, first to Husb No 2437
150	{ B B		Ohio Ohio	First marriage, 2d to Wife No 651, third to Wife No 652 Sister of Husb. No 3444 and Wife No 3792. Died 1862
151	{ B Inf	Sickness	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage, 1st to Wife No 650, third to Wife No. 652 Dead
152	{ B 1 1/2	Spotted fever	Ohio Ohio	Third marriage, first to Wife No 650, second to Wife No 651
153	{ 2 —	Scarlet fever	S C —	Not deaf
154	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Gather'g in head Measles	Ohio Ohio	First marriage, second to Wife No 923 Second marriage, first to Husb No 2224 Died 1890,
155	{ B —		S C —	Brother of Husb No 656 Not deaf
156	{ B —		S C —	Brother of Husb No 655 Not deaf
157	{ 2 B	Fever	Ohio Ohio	Divorced First marriage, second to Husb No 2066 Died 1890
158	{ 6 —	Scarlet fever	Ohio. —	First marriage, second to Wife No 863 Divorced Not deaf Died 1889
159	{ 5 3	Typhoid fever Scarlet fever	W Va W. Va	
160	{ B B		Pa Pa	Second marriage, first to Husb No 3374 Died 1889
161	{ 1 —	Quinine	Ky —	First marriage, second to Wife No 662 Died 1887
162	{ 1 1 1/2	Quinine Whooping cough	Ky Ky	Second marriage, first to Wife No 661 Parents cousins
163	{ B 1	Brain fever	Wis & Eng Minn	
164	{ — 1 1/2	— Erysipelas	— Minn	Not deaf
165	{ B B		Pa Pa	Sister of Husb No 1976
166	{ 2	Spotted fever	Kendall Kendall	Died 1890
167	{ Chl. B	.. ..	N Y Pa	First marriage, second to Wife No 668 Dead
168	{ Chl —	.. ..	N Y Pa	Second marriage; first to Wife No 667
169	{ 1 1/2 B	Measles .. ..	Pa Pa	Brother of Wife No 2894 Sister of Husb No. 2233
170	{ B —	.. ..	N Y Pa	Parents second cousins
171	{ 5 Inf	Billious fever —	Mich —	

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information.		No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
	Date of marriage.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown.	
672	1890	1879	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1852	8 2	1 1	7 1	—	— —
673	1890	1862	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1845	3 5	1 1	2 4	—	— —
674	1889	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1861	4 7	1 1	3 6	—	— —
675	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1863	9 8	3 1	6 7	—	— —
676	1890	1840	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1802 Wife 1805	10 12	4 7	5 5	1 —	— —
677	1890	1850	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1823 Wife 1807	9 10	4 4	5 5	— 1	Nephew, 2 cousins (Husb No 764 and Wife No 3229), 1 third cousin
678	1890	1882	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1823 Wife 1814	9 10	4 4	5 5	— 1	Nephew; 2 cousins (Husb No 764 and Wife No 3229), 1 third cousin
679	1892	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1864	3 7	1 1	2 6	—	— —
680	1890	1882	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1856	2 1	1 1	1 —	—	.. . . . .
681	1890	1866	8	—	8	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1844	3 4	1 1	2 3	—	— .. . . . .
682	1891	1888	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1865	5 9	1 1	4 8	—	— —
683	1890	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1865	8 4	1 2	7 2	—	Cousin (Husb No 3917) .. . . . .
684	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife	1	1		—	.. . . . .
685	1889		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1862	6 1	1 1	5 —	—	— —
686	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1837	2 1	2 1		—	.. . . . .
687	1889	1857	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	.. . . . .
688	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1826	1 9	1 3	1 6	—	4 nephews and nieces (including Husb No. 3095)
689	1890	1858	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1836	6 2	1 1	5 1	—	— —
690	1890	1872	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife	1	1		—	.. . . . .
691	1889	1868	5	2	3	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife	3 7	1 1	2 6	—	— —
692	1889	1884	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1853	11 9	3 1	8 8	—	Third cousin (Husb No. 671)
693	1890	1872	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1850	4 6	1 2	3 4	—	.. . . . .
694	1894	1882	4	—	2	2	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1859	9 3	1 1	8 2	—	..... .. . . . .
695	1890	1873	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1830 Wife 1839	3 12	1 1	2 7	—	A second cousin .. . . . .
696	1890	1879	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1847	10	1	9	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
72	{ B 2	Scarlet fever	N Y N, Y & Pa	
73	{ 2 1/2 4	Whooping cough Measles	N Y N Y & Cal	
74	{ 5 3	Spotted fever Brain fever	Cal Cal	
75	{ B 1	Sickness	Pa W Pa,	Brother of Wife No 930
76	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Brother of Wife No 678, Wife No 677, Husb No. 697, Wife No 512 Died 1869
77	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Sister of Husb No 3169, Husb No 3171, Husb No 3172, Wife No 697 Paternal grandparents were cousins
78	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 678 Brother of Husb. No 713 and Wife No 3830 Died 1888
79	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Sister of Wife No 512, Husb No 676, Wife No 678, Husb. No 697 Died 1881.
80	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 677 Brother of Husb No 713 and Wife No 3830 Died 1888
81	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Husb No 3170, Sister of Wife No 512, Husb No 676, Wife No 678, Husb No 697 Died 1887
82	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Sores in head Worm fever	Hartford Hartford	
83	{ 12 12	Inflam of head	Ohio & Coll Le Couteulx	Separated.
84	{ 2 5	Gathering in ears Cong'n of brain.	Ill Ill	
85	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Paralysis Brain fever	Iowa Iowa	
86	{ B B		Hartf'd & H M Hartford	
87	{ 8 —	Typhoid fever	Kendall —	Not deaf
88	{ B 2	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	Married also to Husb. No 1781.
89	{ B B	Typhoid fever.	Pa Le Couteulx	Brother of Wife No 3791.
90	{ 5 —	Scarlet fever	England Pa	
91	{ 10 B	Colds.	Pa Pa	First marriage, second to wife No 621
92	{ 5 B	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Wife No 2919
93	{ 9 —	Scarlet fever	Wis —	Brother of Wife No 576
94	{ B 6	Scarlet fever.	Ind & Mich —	Not deaf
95	{ B 1	Scarlet fever.	Mich Mich	Attended hearing schools
96	{ 3 B	Measles	Mich. Mich.	Brother of Wife No. 1486 and Wife No 3155.
97	{ 6 —	Brain fever... Rheum in head.	Ohio. Ohio	
98	{ 5 10	Scarlet fever Cold in head.	N Y N Y	Died 1893.
99	{ 3 3	Hare-lip Sickness	Cal Cal	



## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.	
697	1894	1865	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1820	10	4	5	1	
							{ Wife 1828	12	7	5	—	
698	1892	1874	6	—	4	2	{ Husband 1852	9	5	4	—	
							{ Wife 1868	9	1	8	—	
699	1890	1874	6	—	4	2	{ Husband 1849	9	5	4	—	
							{ Wife 1853	9	1	8	—	
700	1891	1881	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1855	9	5	4	—	
							{ Wife 1857	3	1	2	—	
701	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1847	6	1	5	—	Great-uncle
							{ Wife 1866	3	2	1	—	
702	1892	1891	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1871	7	1	6	—	
							{ Wife					
703	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866	1	1			
							{ Wife	2	1	1	—	
704	1891		1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1861	1	1			
							{ Wife	1	1			
705	1893			—	—		{ Husband 1861	1	1			
							{ Wife					
706	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband	6	3	3	—	
							{ Wife 1852	5	3	2	—	
707	1890		6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1814	1	1			4 cousins
							{ Wife 1813	8	1	7	—	
708	1891	1883	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1859	5	1	4	—	
							{ Wife	7	—	7	—	
709	1893	1892	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1861	4	1	3	—	
							{ Wife 1863	1	1			
710	1889			—	—		{ Husband 1831	1	1			
							{ Wife	1	1			
711	1890	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1860	1	1			
							{ Wife 1859	1	1			
712	1890	1875	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1825	1	1			
							{ Wife 1843	5	1	4	—	
713	1890	1863	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1837	9	4	5	—	Nephew, 2 cousins (Husb No 764 & Wife No 3229), 1 third cousin.
							{ Wife 1839	3	1	2	—	
714	1890			—	—		{ Husband 1808	1	1			
							{ Wife 1808	3	3			
715	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864	1	1			
							{ Wife	1	1			
716	1892	1890		—	—		{ Husband	2	1		1	
							{ Wife	—				
717	1890	1881	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1836	7	1	6	—	.....
							{ Wife 1864	3	1	2	—	
718	1890			—	—		{ Husband 1863	1	1			.....
							{ Wife 1861	1	1			
719	1890	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband	4	—	4	—	
							{ Wife 1866	5	1	4	—	
720	1891	1889	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1860	1	1			
							{ Wife 1861	1	1			
							{ Husband 1849	1	1	—	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
97	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Bro. of Husb No 676, Wife No 678, Wife No 677, Wife No 512. Died 1894 Second marriage; first to Husb No 4065 Sister of Wife No 676, Husb No 3169, Husb No 3171, Husb No 3172 Paternal grandparents were cousins.
98	{ B 6	Spotted fever	Ind Ind	Parents first cousins Brother of Husb No. 699, Husb No 700, Wife No 832, Wife No 3463
99	{ B 11	Spotted fever	Ind Ind	Parents first cousins Brother of Husb No 698, Husb No 700, Wife No 832, Wife No 3463
00	{ B 4	Scarlet fever	Ind Ind	Parents first cousins Brother of Husb No 698, Husb No. 699, Wife No 832, Wife No 3463
01	{ Inf 2	Scarlet fever Risings in ears	Va & Miss Miss	
02	{ 4½	Spinal meningitis	H Maun, Beverly, Hart	
03	{ 3½ 14	Brain fever Paralysis of the auditory nerves	Neb Neb	
04	{ 1	Brain fever	Ind	Divorced about 1888 First marriage, second to Wife No 705
05	{ 1 —	Brain fever	Ind	Second marriage, first to Wife No 704 Not deaf Second marriage
06	{ 1	Cold	N Y	Parents second cousins.
07	{ 2 6	A fall Accident	Hartford Hartford	Dead Dead Mother of Wife No. 1076
08	{ 12 —	Scarlet fever	N O	Not deaf
09	{ 1 B	Scarlet fever	Pa & Coll W Pa	
10	{ 1¼	Fits and fever	N Y N. Y	
11	{ 4 3	Swelling in head Scarlet fever	Ill Ill	
12	{ 1½ 2	Epilepsy. Convulsions	N Y Pa	Second marriage, first to Wife No 919
13	{ B 3	Brain fever	Hartford Hartford	Brother of Wife No 3830 and Husb. No 677. Died 1868. First marriage; second to Husb. No 4082
14	{ 3 B	Cold	N Y N Y	Sister of Wife No 431
15	{ B B		Ky Ky	
16	{ —		Edinburgh	Not deaf.
17	{ 8 4	Croup Scarlet fever	Ind. Ia	
18	{ 1½ B	Fever.	W. Va W Va.	
19	{ — 9		S O	Not deaf.
20	{ 5	Brain fever	N Y C N. Y	
21	{ 2½		Hart'd & Coll	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
722	1891		5	—	5	—	{ Husband { Wife 1838	1	1			
723	1892		1			1	{ Husb . { Wife	1	1			
724	1890	sev.	—	sev	—	—	{ Husband { Wife 1840	1	1			—
725	1890		2			2	{ Husb { Wife	1	1			
726	1892	1886	3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1861 { Wife 1859	5	1	7	—	—
727	1892	1886	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1860 { Wife 1861	3	2	1	—	....
728	1894	sev	—	all	—	—	{ Husband 1840 { Wife	1	1			—
729	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1858 { Wife 1890	1	1			—
730	1892		2	1	1	—	{ Husband 1842 { Wife 1849	1	1			—
731	1892						{ Husband { Wife	1	1			
732	1894	1893	1			1	{ Husband 1896 { Wife	12	1	11	—	—
733	1890						{ Husband { Wife	1	1			
734	1893	1889	1			1	{ Husband 1856 { Wife 1869	3	1	2	—	...
735	1890	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1859 { Wife 1857	13	1	12	—	2 cousins
736	1892	1892					{ Husband 1868 { Wife 1874	4	4			Cousin (Wife No 736)
737	1890						{ Husband 1861 { Wife 1859	1	1			Parents (No 3232), uncle (Husb No 2600), aunt (Wife No 2600), 4 cousins (including Wife No. 412 and Husb No 736)
738	1890		3	1	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1	1			
739	1898		2		1	1	{ Husband { Wife	1	1			
740	1893		1			1	{ Husb { Wife 1860	1	1			
741	1890						{ Husband 1860 { Wife	1	1			
742	1890	1877	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1853 { Wife 1858	1	1			
743	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1853 { Wife 1864	1	1			
744	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1854 { Wife 1861	2	2			
745	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husb { Wife 1870	1	1			Cousin
746	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husb { Wife 1861	2	2			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
22	{ —	—	N Y	Not deaf
23	{	.	.	
24	{ 3 —	Pneumonia	Ala	Not deaf
25	{			
26	{ 4 4	B'n fev & dipht'a Brain fever	Ind. Ind	
27	{ B B		N C N C	Sister of Husb No 2090, Wife No 4176
28	{ 12 —	Mumps	Ga	Not deaf
29	{ B B		Ga Ga	Divorced Parents cousins. Parents third cousins
30	{ 1 B	Winter fever	Texas Texas	
31	{ —	—	N Y	Wife deserted him soon after marriage Not deaf
32	{ 2½+ —	Gathering in head	N Y & Pa	Semi-mute Ed. in public schools.
33	{ 3 —	Measles	Ky	Not deaf
34	{ 2 1	Measles Measles	Ill Ill	Died 1893
35	{ 13 —	Meningitis ....	Miss and Coll	Not deaf
36	{ B B		Va., Ill & Mo Kans	Parents cousins. Married his cousin Sister of Husb. No. 3231
37	{ 1½ B	Brain fever	Ill Ill	Sister of Wife No. 513
38	{ . —	—	—	Not deaf Dead. Mother of Wife No 4424
39	{ —	—	Tenn .	Not deaf.
40	{	. . . . .	Ala	
41	{ 1 —	Ulcers in head .	Hartford .	
42	{ 7 8	A fall . Canker rash	Hartford . Hartford .	First marriage; second to Wife No. 743 Died 1883.
43	{ 7 2	A fall . Chol. infantum .	Hartford Hartford .	Second marriage, first to Wife No 742
44	{ 3 —	Brain fever .	Ill . . . Ill . . .	Brother of Wife No 1892 Parents cousins
45	{ 3 —	Spinal meningitis	Kans. & Ill	
46	{ B —	. . . . .	Ind . . . . .	Parents second cousins

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per-son recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]	
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
747	1891	1873	5	2	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1824	2	2			...
748	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1869	1	1			—
749	1890	—	3	1	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1859	4	1	3		—
750	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1856	1	1			
751	1889	—	4	—	—	4	{ Husband Wife	—	1	1			
752	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1870	1	1			
753	1893	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	—	1	1			
754	1890	1877	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1846	4	1	3		—
755	1890	—	2	2	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1842	1	1			
756	1892	1890	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1859	2	2			Parents (No 755) Cousin
757	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	—	1	1			
758	1890	—	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1852	1	1			—
759	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1863	1	1			..
760	1890	1869	6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1836	13	7	6		—
761	1889	—	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1865	1	1			—
762	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1848	1	1			
763	1890	1856	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1825	3	1	2		—
764	1890	1849	6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1803	5	2	3		4 cousins (including Husb No 677, Husb No 716, Wife No 2830).
765	1891	1858	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1836	2	2			—
766	1891	1891	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1808	4	4			—
767	1891	sev	—	all	—	—	{ Husband Wife	—	1	1			—
768	1892	1889	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1857	2	1	1		—
769	1890	1878	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1846	4	2	2		—
770	1890	1861	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1838	8	1	7		Niece (Wife No 3612). Mother gradu- ally became deaf; also an aunt late in life.
771	1893	1870	5	—	4	1	{ Husband Wife	1838	8	1	7		—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
747	{ 5 B	Disease in head	N Y N Y	
748	{ 3	Paralysis of brain	Mich Mich	
749	{ B	—	Cal	Not deaf Sister of Husband No 3856.
750	{ 7	Scarlet fever	Ky Ind	
751	{ —	—	—	Died 1889 Not at school Not deaf
752	{ 7 2	Scarlet fever Spinal meningitis	St Joseph's St Joseph's	
753	{		Ia	
754	{ B 1	Scarlet fever	Ohio Ky	Died 1887 First marriage, second to Husb No 2302
755	{ 4	Inflammation	Scotland Ind	Mother of Husb. No 756
756	{ 2 9	Scarlet fever. Spotted fever	Ind. Ind	.....
757	{ —	—	—	Semi-mute Not deaf
758	{ 3 Inf	Cold in head	.	
759	{ 4 9	Spinal fever Spotted fever	Ill Ill	
760	{ B 2	Catarrh	Va, Hart & N Y Va.	Cousin of Wife No 3923
761	{ 1	Measles.	Wis Hartford	Parents cousins
762	{ B —	—	S C	Not deaf
763	{ 1	Inflam'n in head	Hartford	Not deaf Second marriage; first to a hearing man
764	{ B 1 1/2	Whooping cough.	Hartford. Hartford.	Brother of Wife No 3229 Died 1875 First marriage, second to Husb No 3699
765	{ B 1 1/2	Scarlet fever.	N Y N Y.	... Brother of Wife No. 3228. Died 1866.
766	{ B 6	Measles	Hartford N. Y	..
767	{ — 17	Cold (sudden loss)	N. Y.	Not deaf.
768	{ 1/2 B	Scarlet fever.	Hartford Hartford	
769	{ 1/2 2	Scarlet fever ...	Hartf'd & Coll Hartford	Parents cousins Parents cousins.
770	{ 2 —	Catarrhal fever	Hartford	First marriage; second to Wife No 771 Divorced. After age of 25 she became, gradually, deaf. Second marriage; first to a hearing man Sister of Wife No. 1531, Husb. No 262, Wife No. 2819
771	{ 2 2	Catarrhal fever... Measles & whooping cough	Hartford ..... Hartford A....	Second marriage; first to Wife No 770

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
772	1890	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1858	10 8	1 1	9 7	—	
773	1893	1890	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1860	1 6	1 3	—	—	
774	1890						{ Husband 1851 Wife	1 1	1 1			
775	1891	1890	1			1	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1861	1 8	1 1	7	—	
776	1892	1886	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife	1 1	1 1			
777	1890						{ Husband 1856 Wife	13	1	12	—	4 distant cousins
778	1892						{ Husb Wife 1859	1	1			
779	1893	1891	1			1	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1869	1 1	1 1			
780	1892	1891					{ Husband 1862 Wife 1867	1 1	1 1			
781	1890		3	1	2	—	{ Husband Wife	4	4			Second cousin (Husb No. 1839)
782	1890	1886	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1865	13 2	2 1	11 1	—	Parents (No 783), grandmother (Wife No 781), 2 great-uncles, great aunt, great-grandfather, fourth cousins (Husb No 1839, Husb No 1840, Wife No 2628)
783	1890	1863	13	2	11	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1841	3 10	1 1	2 9	—	Mother (Wife No 781), 2 uncles; aunt, 2 cousins (Wife No 783 and Husb No 1837)
784	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife	11 7	1 —	10 7	—	Grandfather, 7 cousins (including Husb No 784, Husb. No 1871, Husb No 1839, Husb No 1840, Wife No 2628)
785	1890						{ Husband 1824 Wife 1824	1 2	1 2			
786	1890						{ Husband 1856 Wife	1	1			
787	1890						{ Husband 1816 Wife 1826	1 2	1 2			
788	1890						{ Husband 1847 Wife 1853	1 1	1 1			
789	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1832	9 4	1 2	8 2	—	4 other relatives.
790	1890	1840	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1814 Wife 1811	5 6	1 4	4 2	—	Nephew (Husb No. 1053); niece (Wife No 328)
791	1890	1844	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1814 Wife 1821	5 4	1 1	4 3	—	
792	1890	1857	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1814 Wife 1816	5 8	1 5	4 3	—	Cousin.
793	1892	1877	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1852	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	Cousins (including Wife No. 793, Wife No. 4312). Cousins (including Husb. No 793) ..

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
772	{ B 2½	Erysipelas	Va Va	
773	{ 3 B	Run over by a cart	Clarke & H'fd Hartford	Sister of Wife No 2785
774	{ 1½ B	Winter fever	Ill	First marriage, second to Wife No 775
775	{ 1½ 3	Winter fever Sickness	Ill Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 774
776	{	.	Ohio Ky	
777	{ 9	Spotted fever	Ia	Divorced
778	{ 5	Spotted fever	Ind	First marriage, second to Husb No 2309
779	{ 15	A fall Neuralgia	W Va & Va Va	
780	{ 2 2	Typhus fever Typhoid fever	Neb Neb & O	
781	{ B	—	—	Not deaf Mother of Husb No 783
782	{ 2	Bleeding at ears	Va	Parents cousins
783	{ Inf 8½ B	Brain fever Measles .	Va Va Va	Married his cousin Mother of Husb No 782
784	{ B —	... ..	Hartford	Not deaf Mother of Wife No 28
785	{ 2	Inflam in head	N. Y N Y	
786	{ 8	Typhoid fever		
787	{ 3 B	Sickness & fever	N Y N Y	
788	{ 5 2	Scarlet fever. Sc'let & b'n fevs	N Y ...	
789	{ B B	.	Hartford Hartford	
790	{ 2 B	Measles . . ..	Hartford Hartford	First marriage; second to Wife No 791; third to Wife No. 792 Died 1877 Sister of Wife No 1710 and Husb No 1055 Dead
791	{ 2 Inf	Measles Illness	Hartford Hartford.	Second marriage, first to Wife No 790; third to Wife No 792 Died 1877 Died 1856.
792	{ 2 B	Measles ..	Hartford Hartford	Third marriage, first to Wife No 790, second to Wife No 791. Died 1877 Sister of Wife No 3058, Husb No 3888
793	{ 4 1½	Mumps Scarlet fever. . .	Ind . . Ind . .	Parents cousins He married his cousin



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown	
794	1890							{ Husband Wife	1	1		
795	1890						{ Husband 1812 Wife 1812	9 11	3 3	6 8	—	
796	1891 1890						{ Husband 1863 Wife 1863	1 1	1 1			
797	1890 1871	7	—	7	—		{ Husband 1844 Wife 1843	5 2	2 1	3 1	—	
798	1890 1889						{ Husband 1867 Wife 1866	5 1	1 1	4	—	— —
799	1892	sev				all	{ Husb Wife	1	1			
800	1892	1	—	1	—		{ Husband 1847 Wife 1844	4 4	1 2	3 2	—	
801	1892	1				1	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1860	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	9 cousins, 2 uncles, 1 aunt
802	1890						{ Husband Wife 1862	1 1	1 1			—
803	1892						{ Husband 1818 Wife 1820	7 4	1 1	6 3	—	
804	1891	4	—	4	—		{ Husband 1848 Wife 1861	2 1	2 1			
805	1890 1819	6	—	6	—		{ Husband 1785 Wife 1793	1 2	1 2			
806	1890						{ Husband Wife 1862	3	1	2	—	—
807	1891 1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1864	1 1	1 1			.. .
808	1890 1873	4	—	4	—		{ Husband 1853 Wife	9 7	9 —	— 7	—	Parents (No 810); 3 uncles (Husb. No 809 is one), aunt, third cousin.
809	1890 1836	1	—	1	—		{ Husband Wife	7	2	5	—	9 nephews and nieces (including Wife No 813, Husb No 808, Husb. No 811, Husb No 812, Wife No 3879), cousin.
810	1890	9	9	—	—		{ Husband 1823 Wife	7 12	2 4	5 8	—	Cousin
811	1890 1887	2	—	2	—		{ Husband 1860 Wife	9 12	9 —	— 12	—	Parents (No 810), 3 uncles (Husb No. 809 is one); aunt. 2 aunts, 1 uncle
812	1890 1881	2	—	2	—		{ Husband 1856 Wife 1867	9 1	9 1	— 1	—	Parents (No 810); 3 uncles (Husb. No. 809 is one); aunt
813	1890	2	—	1	1		{ Husband 1816 Wife	11	8	8	—	.. . . . .
814	1894 1892	1	—	1	—		{ Husband 1862 Wife 1868	1 4	1 1		3	— —
815	1890 1880	6	—	6	—		{ Husband 1808 Wife 1813	6 8	1 1	5 7	—	.. . . . .
816	1890	1				1	{ Husb Wife	1	1			.. . . . .
817	1890						{ Husband 1800	4	8	1	—	.. . . . .

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
94	{		Texas	
95	{ 2 B	Spotted fever	Hartford Hartford	Brother of Wife No 1527 Died 1861. Sister of Wife No 1770 and Wife No. 1047 Died 1884
96	{ 2 1	A cold Spotted fever	Ia ,Neb & Ken Ia	
97	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	
98	{ 5 4	Spinal meningitis Cerebro-sp men	W N Y W N Y	
99	{			Dead
100	{ 5½ B	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	Sister of Husband No. 2163
101	{ 1½ 6	Brain fever Cong'n of brain	Ark Ark	Second marriage , first to Wife No 613
102	{	3 Typhoid fever.	Ia	
103	{ 2½ 3	Typhus fever Illness	Hartford Hartford	Died 1837 Died 1892
104	{ B 5	Mumps	Ill Ill	Brother of Wife No 380 Parents 3d cousins
105	{ 1 2½	A fall Illness	Paris Hartford	Died 1869 Died 1880
106	{ — 1½	Gather'g in head	Mich	Not deaf
107	{ 4 1½	Scarlet fever Intermit fever	Ky Ky	Second marriage , first to Husb. No. 1190
108	{ B —	—	N C	Brother of Husb No 811, Wife No 3879, Wife No 613, Husb No 812 Not deaf
109	{ B —	—	—	Not at school Twice married to hearing wives Brother of Husb No 810 Not deaf
110	{ B B	—	N C N C	Brother of Husb No. 809 Mother of Wife No 613, Husb No 808, Husb No 811, Husb No 812, Wife No. 3879
111	{ B —	—	N C	Brother of Husb No. 808, Husb No 812, Wife No 613, Wife No 3879 Not deaf
112	{ B B	—	N C N C	Brother of Husb No. 811, Husb No 808, Wife No 613, Wife No 3879.
113	{ B —	—	Hartford	Brother of Wife No. 3881 Died 1882. Not deaf
114	{ 7 4	Quinine Spotted fever	Ill & College Ill & College	
115	{ 6 2½	Spotted fever Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Died 1871.
116	{			Dead
117	{ 2 —	Illness. ....	Hartford	Not deaf.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
818	1891						{ Husband 1860 Wife 1862	1 1	1 1			
819	1891						{ Husband 1864 Wife	1 1	1			
820	1890						{ Husband Wife 1819	9 3	6			Niece (Wife No. 2727), second cousin father partially
821	1890	2	—	2	—		{ Husband 1859 Wife 1863	1 1	1 1			
822	1892						{ Husb. Wife	1 1				Cousin
823	1890	—	—	—	—		{ Husband Wife 1862	1 9	1 1	8	—	
824	1893 1889	1	—	1	—		{ Husband 1860 Wife 1862	4 11	3 1	1 10	—	
825	1890	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1858 Wife	3 1	1 2	—	—	
826	1890	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1858 Wife 1849	3 1	1 1	2	—	
827	1890 1883	3	—	1	2		{ Husband Wife 1851	6 2	2 4	—	—	
828	1891						{ Husband Wife	3 1	3 1			
829	1892	1				1	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			
830	1892 1892	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1853 Wife 1862	7 3	1 1	6 2	—	
831	1891 1891	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1866 Wife 1868	4 4	2 1	2 3	—	
832	1890 1858	14	—	14	—		{ Husband 1837 Wife 1843	1 9	1 5	1 4	—	2 uncles (Husb No 946, Husb ? 1024)
833	1890	1				1	{ Husband 1861 Wife	1 1	1 1			
834	1891	1				1	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1856	1 6	1 2	1 4	—	
835	1891						{ Husb. Wife	1 1	1			
836	1892 1892	—	—	—	—		{ Husband Wife 1870	2 2	2	—	—	
837	1891 1891	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1862 Wife 1866	1 1	1 1			Cousin (Husb No 838).
838	1890	1	—	1	—		{ Husband 1848 Wife 1850	1 3	1 2	1	—	Cousin (Husb No 837)
839	1893						{ Husb Wife 1846	2	1	1	—	
840	1890 1850	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1822 Wife 1826	7 3	2 3	5	—	
841	1890	2	—	2	—		{ Husband 1796 Wife	1 1	1 1			
842	1892	sev.	—	all	—		{ Husband 1850 Wife 1854	1 1	1 1			
							{ Husband 1837	9	9			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
8 {	6 11	Inflam of brain Typhoid fever	Ill Ill	
9 {	7	Spotted fever	Ind	
10 {	B	-----	Hartford	Not deaf Sister of Husb No 522, Wife No 3701, Wife No 1175. Dead
11 {	11 1/2 1 3/4	Sickness Brain fever	Ill Ill	
12 {				
13 {	3	Erysipelas in he'd	W N Y	Died 1886
14 {	2 2	Cerebro-sp men Gath'g in ears.	Wis Wis	
15 {	1 1/2	Measles	Cal	Also married to Wife No 826 Not deaf
16 {	1 3/4 3	Measles Brain fever	Cal	Also married to Wife No 825 Second marriage
17 {	B	-----	Hartford	Not deaf
18 {	B		N Y	Dead
19 {			Tenn Tenn	
20 {	10 1 3/4	Spinal meningitis Spotted fever	S C & Coll N Y.	
21 {	B 5	Spotted fever	Pa W Pa	
22 {	5	Vomiting	Ind.	
23 {	B		Ind	Parents cousins Sister of Husb. No 699, Husb. No. 698, Husb No 700, Wife No. 3463
24 {	3 3/4	Spotted fever	Ind. & Kendall	
25 {	Inf 2	Scarlet fever Cold in head	N Y N. Y	Parents cousins
26 {				Died 1891
27 {	3 3/4	Cerebro sp men.	N Y	Not deaf
28 {	5	Spinal meningitis Spinal meningitis	Ill Ill	
29 {	1 1/2 B	Hydrocephalus.	Ill. Ill.	
30 {	B		Ohio	
31 {	B B		Hartford N. Y	Died 1878 Sister of Wife No 610 and Wife No 3560
32 {	B		Hartford.	Died 1882
33 {	3 1	Scarlet fever Brain fever	Texas Texas	
34 {	7 4	Cerebro-sp men Scarlet fever	Wis.	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES										PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE									
Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per-son recorded)				Deaf Relatives, [Not including brothers and sisters nor children ]							
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown								
844	1891						{ Husband 1822 Wife 1825	1 1	1 1										
845	1892						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1										
846	1893 1892	1				1	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1870	1 3	1 1	— 2	— —								
847	1892						{ Husband 1844 Wife 1846	1 1	1 1			Uncle							
848	1891	2	—		2	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1859	4 6	3 6	1 —	—	3 deaf in family 3 generations back, mother's side							
849	1890						{ Husband 1809 Wife	1 1	1 1										
850	1892						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1										
851	1890 1856	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1835	14 6	1 3	12 3	— —								
852	1893 1884						{ Husband Wife 1853	1 1	1 1										
853	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1865	20 4	1 1	19 3	— —								
854	1894	1	1	—	—	—	{ Husband 1807 Wife 1817	1 1	1 1			"Some relatives"							
855	1893 1883	1	—	—	1	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1856	1 2	1 1	1 —	—								
856	1890	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband 1824 Wife 1823	1 4	1 4										
857	1890 1863	5	—	5	—	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1840	1 1	1 1										
858	1890 1872	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1850	8 14	1 4	7 10	— —								
859	1891 1842	2	1	1	—	—	{ Husband 1815 Wife 1820	1 5	1 1		4 —								
860	1890 1867	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1828	2 5	2 1		4 —								
861	1893 1892	1			1	—	{ Husband Wife 1871	4	1	3	—								
862	1894 1872	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1846	8 3	2 1	4 2	— —	Aunt partially deaf Father, aunt, 2 uncles, hard of hea							
863	1893 1892	2	—	1	1	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1861	6 13	1 3	5 10	— —								
864	1891 1886	1			1	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1848	1 3	1 1		2 —								
865	1894 1892	1			1	—	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1863	11 6	1 1	10 5	— —								
866	1892	sev	—	all	—	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1850	1 1	1 1										
867	1890						{ Husband 1847 Wife	1	1										
868	1890 1859	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1834	3 4	1 1	2 3	— —								

# *Tabular Statement of Marriages.*

207

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
44	{ 2 B	Measles	N. Y N Y	
45	{		....	
46	{ B B		N Y W N Y	
47	{ 1 B	Scarlet fever	Texas Texas	
48	{ B B		N Y & C N Y N Y	Brother of Wife No 2977
49	{ 6 —	Whooping cough	Pa ———	Not deaf
50	{		———	Semi-mute
51	{ B B		Hartford Hartford.	Sister of Husb No 2291 Parents cousins.
52	{ 3	Scarlet fever	Cal & N Y	
53	{ 3 1/2	Spinal meningitis Scarlet fever and diphtheria	C N Y C N Y, & W N Y C N Y C N Y	Died 1891 First marriage, second to Husb No 343 Parents second cousins
54	{ Inf	Fall.		Mother of Wife No 2137 Died 1894.
55	{ 1/2 2	Brain fever Diphtheria	Hartford Hartford	
56	{		N C N C	
57	{ 6 (3) 1/2	Fever Spasms	Ill Ill	
	{ B 1/2	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Husb No 543
	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Died 1891
	{ 6	Scarlet fever	N Y Hartford	
	{ 2	Spinal meningitis	Le Couteux & Mich	
	{ 2 B	Whooping cough	Hart & N Y N Y.	Parents cousins Died 1892
	{ 6 3	Scarlet fever Measles	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 658 Sister of Husb. No 992
	{ B 1/2	Sores in head	N Y Hartford, ..	
	{ 6 1	Scarlet fever. Scarlet fever.	N Y Imp'd. W N Y.	
	{ B 1/2	Sore ears . . .	Ill. & Ohio Ill	
	{ Inf —	———	Ga . . . .	Not deaf. Dead
	{ B ( 4	Scarlet fever..	Hartford Hartford .	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
869	1890						{ Husband 1861 Wife 1861	1 1	1 1			
870	1893						{ Husband 1849 Wife 1852	1 1	1 1			
871	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1871 Wife 1865	5 9	1 1	4 8	—	Cousin
872	1892	1892					{ Husband 1870 Wife 1866	6 6	1 1	5 5	—	
873	1892		2			2	{ Husband Wife					
874	1890						{ Husband 1807 Wife 1806	6 10	1 1	5 9	—	
875	1890						{ Husband 1807 Wife 1806	6 10	1 1	5 9	—	
876	1890						{ Husband 1813 Wife	6	6			
877	1890	1852					{ Husband 1825 Wife 1827	6 1	6 1			
878	1892	1850	5			5	{ Husband 1820 Wife	5 1	4 1	1	—	
879	1893	1892					{ Husband Wife					
880	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife	1	1			
881	1890	1865					{ Husband 1833 Wife 1834	5 4	1 2	4 2	—	
882	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1857	1 1	1 1			Cousin
883	1892						{ Husband 1853 Wife 1864	1 1	1 1			
884	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1860	1 7	1 1		6	
885	1890						{ Husband 1847 Wife 1854	1 2	1 2			
886	1892	1890	1			1	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1867	4 9	1 1	3 8	—	
887	1890	1858					{ Husband Wife 1833	1 3	1 3			
888	1892	1879	—	4	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1846	2 2				2 cousins (Wife No 888 is one), and Father
889	1890	1863	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1835	8 5	3 1	3 4	—	
890	1891		3			3	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1846	1 3	1 3			
891	1890	1890	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1860	9 6	1 1	8 5	—	
892	1894	1889					{ Husband 1864 Wife 1865	1 1	1 1			
893	1890	1896	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife 1871	1 3	1 1		2	Paternal grandfather.
894	1892						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
369	{ 2 4	Cong'n of brain Inflam of brain	Ill Ill	Divorced. Dead First marriage, second to Husb No 3866. Parents third cousins,
370	{ 2½ 10	Scarlet fever Congestive fever	Ind Ind . .	
371	{ 2 1½	Cerebro-sp men Sickness	N Y & Ohio Ohio	
372	{ 1½ 15½	Meningitis Teething & Conv	St Jos & N J N Y & N. J	
373	{		.	
374	{ 1½ 2	Scarlet fever Fever	Hartford Hartford	First marriage; second to Wife No 875 Has 2 children, by which marriage is unknown Dead
375	{ 1½ 6	Scarlet fever Disease in head	Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 874 Dead.
76	{ B	. . . . .	C N Y & N Y.	Brother of Husb No 877, Wife No 4354
77	{ B	. . . . .	C N Y & N Y N Y	Brother of Husb No 876, Wife No 4354
78	{ B	. . . . .	Pa . .	Brother of Wife No 667 Died 1892
79	{	Measles .	Ia . . . . .	Not deaf. Third marriage, first to Husb. No 3175, second to Husb No 1861 Sister of Wife No 885.
80	{ 11	Brain fever	Ga . .	Not deaf
81	{ B B		Hartford . Hartford . . .	
82	{ B 6	Spinal disease	Ill Ill	First marriage, second to Wife No 883.
83	{ B		Ill . Ill . . .	Second marriage, first to Wife No 882.
84	{ 2½ 3	Brain fever . Scarlet fever	C N Y C N. Y	
85	{ 2 1	Scrofula	Ia. . . . . Ia. . . . .	Sister of Wife No. 879.
86	{ 7 3½	Scarlet fever. Spotted fever	Pa . . . . Pa . . . .	
87	{ 1½	Salivation & cold	Ky . . . . Ky . . . .	Dead Died 1860
88	{ B	. . . . .	Texas	Not deaf Married his cousin
89	{ Inf 8	Measles	Pa . . . . Pa . . . .	Died 1890.
90	{ 1 B	Scarlet fever .	N Y. N Y. .	Died 1885. Parents cousins
91	{ 10 2	Scarlet fever Measles & cold.	Hartford & Coll Hartford	
92	{ 3½	Billious fever .	Ill. . . . . Ill. . . . .	Parents cousins Dead.
93	{ 4 1½	Measles Sc't rash followed by gather'g in h'd	N Y . . . . W N. Y . . . .	
94	{	. . . . .	Tenn . . . . Tenn . . . .	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
895	1890	1873	5	2	3	—	{Husband 1848 Wife 1850}	9 4	9 1	— 3	—	Paternal grandparents, 2d cousins
896	1894	sev.	—	all	—	—	{Husband 1844 Wife 1844}	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
897	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1860 Wife 1860}	4 1	2 1	2 —	—	—
898	1893	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1860 Wife 1862}	4 6	2 1	2 5	—	—
899	1892	1889	1	—	—	1	{Husband 1862 Wife 1869}	1 8	1 1	— 5	—	....
900	1890	1868	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1848 Wife 1859}	5 3	1 1	4 2	—	—
901	1890	1860	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1823 Wife 1821}	13 8	1 2	8 6	4	Cousin
902	1890	1867	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1841 Wife 1848}	5 7	1 1	4 6	—	—
903	1890	—	3	—	3	—	{Husband 1838 Wife 1840}	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
904	1892	—	4	—	4	—	{Husband 1834 Wife 1839}	1 10	1 2	— 8	—	2 cousins
905	1890	—	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1839 Wife 1843}	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
906	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1839 Wife 1843}	1 4	1 4	—	—	3 nephews and nieces (Wife No. 92a Wife No. 319s)
907	1892	—	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1859 Wife 1857}	1 7	1 1	— 6	—	—
908	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1845 Wife 1842}	7 2	1 1	6 1	—	—
909	1892	1881	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1858 Wife 1858}	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
910	1890	—	6	6	—	—	{Husband 1834 Wife 1843}	3 8	1 4	2 4	—	Niece
911	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1820 Wife 1821}	1 1	1 1	—	—	..
912	1891	1890	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1850 Wife 1850}	1 1	1 1	—	—	..
913	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1821 Wife 1819}	8 8	1 3	7 5	—	..
914	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1878 Wife 1878}	1 1	1 1	—	—	...
915	1890	1882	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1848 Wife 1850}	6 5	1 2	5 3	—	—
916	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1841 Wife 1841}	1 1	1 1	—	—	2 aunts
917	1890	1889	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1868 Wife 1868}	1 1	1 1	—	—	..
918	1894	1873	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1843 Wife 1837}	1 1	1 1	—	—	..
919	1894	1838	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1825 Wife 1839}	1 1	1 1	—	—	..
920	1894	1867	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1826 Wife 1826}	1 1	1 1	—	—	..

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated,	Remarks.
895	{ B B	.	Hartford Hartford	Parents second cousins Brother of Wife No 2514.
896	{ 1 3	Inflam of brain. Winter fever	Ill Ill	
897	{ B		Cal	Brother of Wife No 2599. Married also to Wife No 623 and to Wife No 898
898	{ B 2 1/2	Brain fever	Cal Kans & Cal.	Brother of Wife No 2599 Married also to Wife No 623 and to Wife No 897.
899	{ 2 4	Inflam of brain Typhoid fever	Ind Ill	Parents cousins
900	{ 4 5	Conges'n of brain Scarlet fever	Ia Ia	
901	{ 7 B	Scarlet fever.	----- Hartford	Educated at home Died 1883
902	{ 1 1/2 B	Cold	Hartford Hartford	Died 1884
903	{		N C N C	Died 1890
904	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Scarlet fever Sickness	Ind Ind	Sister of Husb. No 2070
905	{ 6 1	Typhoid fever Influenza	Ia Ia	First marriage, second to Wife No 906 Died 1869
906	{ 6 B	Typhoid fever.	Ia Ia	Second marriage, first to Wife No 905 Sister of Wife No 1178, Wife No 2462, Husb No 4127
907	{ B 2 1/2	Cold in head	Wis Minn	
908	{ B 2	Humors in head.	Hartford Hartford	
909	{ -- 6	Convulsions	----- Texas.	Not deaf
910	{ 1 1/2 B	Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford.	Sister of Husb. No. 188
911	{ 1 1/2 B	Cold	N. Y N Y	
912	{ 8	Scarlet fever.	Ind Ind & Kans	Died 1891.
913	{ 1 1/2 B	Typhus fever	Hartford Hartford	
914	{ 1 1/2	Cold	Kans	
915	{ B B		Hartford. Hartford.	Parents cousins Sister of Wife No. 2168
916	{ B		N. Y	....
917	{ 3 7	Scarlet fever Jumping the rope	St Jos (N Y) ....	
918	{ B	Scarlet fever.	N. Y. N Y.	
919	{ 3 B	Epilepsy.	N Y. N Y	First marriage; second to W Dead.
920	{ 3	Sickness from fright	N. Y.? N. Y....	Dead.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
921	1893		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1845	9 13	4 3	5 10	—	Cousin (Wife No 190)
922	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1867	12 2	1 1	11 1	—	—
923	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1863	11 2	1 1	10 1	—	—
924	1898	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1862	7 2	1 1	6 1	—	—
925	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1856	3	1	2	—	—
926	1894						{ Husband Wife 1873	3	3	—	—	Parents (No 2452), 2 uncles (one is Husb No 4127), 3 aunts (Wife No 3109, Wife No 1178, Wife No 906), 2 third cousins (Wife No 1601, Husb No 2943), fourth cousin
927	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1860	1 1	1 1			
928	1899	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife	1 1	1 1			
929	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1871 Wife 1873	8 4	1 2	7 2	—	—
930	1889	1878	9	—	6	3	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1853	9 9	4 3	5 6	—	—
931	1889	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1866	sev 7	— 1	all 6	—	—
932	1889	1884	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife	1 1	1 1			—
933	1889	1859	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1839	12 4	1 1	11 3	—	—
934	1889		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1810 Wife 1820	1 1	1 1			3 cousins (Wife No 151 is one)
935	1894	1872	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1852	7 5	1 3	6 2	—	—
936	1889	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1853	4 6	1 1	3 5	—	.. ..
937	1890		5	—	4	1	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1856	11 5	6 2	5 3	—	—
938	1889	1876	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1859	11 5	6 1	5 4	—	—
939	1893	1885	3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1864	5 1	1 1	4 —	—	—
940	1889		6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1854	5 9	4 4	1 5	—	.. ..
941	1890	1880	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1845	4 11	1 4	3 7	—	—
942	1889	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1859	5 4	1 2	4 2	—	—
943	1889	1868	1	1	—	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1846	10 7	4 4	6 3	—	Cousins .....
944	1889	1877	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1850	10 9	4 3	6 6	—	Cousins .....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
121	{ 1 B	Chills	Ohio Ohio & Ind	Divorced about 1881 Brother of Wife No 1693
122	{ B 5	Scrofula	Kans Ind	
123	{ 1½ 2	Gather'g in head Brain fever	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 654
124	{ 1½ 2	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Ohio Ind & Ohio	
125	{ —	—	N. Y.	Not deaf.
126	{ — B	—	Is. & Kans	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 3198
127	{ 2	Rising in head	Sweden ? Texas	
128	{ B		Ind	
129	{ 2 B	Spotted fever	W N Y W N Y	
130	{ 2 B	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 983, Wife No 3441 Sister of Husb No 675
131	{ —	—	W Pa	Not deaf
132	{ 6	Mumps	Ark Ark	
133	{ 4 1	Scarlet fever Brain fever	Hartford Hartford	
134	{ 3½	Inflammation	N Y N Y	Died 1859 First marriage, second to Husb No. 4043 Died 1893.
135	{ 1 B	Disease	Pa Pa	Sister of Wife No. 2428
136	{ 2	..	Pa Pa	
137	{ 2 15	Gather'gs in head Spotted fever	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 938 Parents cousins
138	{ 7 B	Measles & sc't fev	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 937 Parents cousins
139	{ 8 3	Scarlet fever Cold	N Y Impr'd & N Y St Joseph's (N. Y)	Died 1893.
140	{ B B	..	Pa Pa	First marriage, second to Wife No 1083 Parents cousins Brother of Wife No 3 and Wife No 2757 Parents first cousins Sister of Husb No 1231 and Husb No 1263
141	{ 5 B	Full	N Y N. Y	Parents cousins Sister of Wife No. 538, Wife No. 2075, Husb. No. 4016
142	{ 1 B	Full	Wis Wis	Sister of Wife No. 3053
143	{ B 2	.. Brain fever	Wis. & N Y Wis & N. Y..	Bro of Husb No 1097 1st marriage; 2d to Wife No. 944. Sister of Wife No. 4054, Husb. No. 1808, Husb No. 1686 Died 1874.
144	{ B 3	.. .. Cold in head	Wis. & N. Y.... Wis . . .	Bro. of Husb. No 1097 2d marriage; 1st to Wife No. 943. Sister of Wife No, 1404

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son recorded]					Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
945	1889	1890	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1857 1858	3 3	1 1	2 2	—		
946	1889	1842	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1820 1820	10 7	3 —	7 7	—	Nephew (Husb No 832), uncle .	
947	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1809 1809	1 1	1 —	— —	—		
948	1889	1873	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1828 1832	5 14	1 3	4 11	—		
949	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1845 1841	11 6	1 1	10 5	—	Second cousin	
950	1894	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife	1861 1865	9 10	1 1	2 9	—	Second cousin	
951	1889	1876	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1834 1837	10 1	3 1	7 —	—		
952	1889	1883	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1834 1846	10 7	3 2	7 5	—		
953	1892	1884	2	—	—	2	{ Husband Wife	1856 1861	4 5	1 4	3 1	—		
954	1889	1883	3	1	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1849 1850	6 4	2 2	4 2	—		
955	1889	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1862	3 3	1 1	2 2	—		
956	1889	1866	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1842 1842	4 8	1 3	3 5	—		
957	1890	1854	1	1	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1827 1836	1 2	1 2	— —	—		
958	1890	1857	8	—	8	—	{ Husband Wife	1816 1836	7 1	1 1	6 —	—		
959	1894	1881	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1837 1847	8 4	1 2	7 2	—	Niece	
960	1889		2	1	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1815 1815	1 2	1 2	— —	—		
961	1889	1827					{ Husband Wife .	1808 1808	3 12	2 6	1 6	—	13 relatives	
962	1890	1880	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1845 1859	7 7	2 1	5 6	—		
963	1890	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	184 1850	7 9	2 1	5 8	—		
964	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1866 1862	7 3	1 1	6 2	—		
965	1890	1879	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1847 1848	5 5	1 2	4 3	—		
966	1889	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1857	10 4	1 1	9 3	—		
967	1891	1879	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1855 1852	7 9	1 1	6 8	—		
968	1890	1883	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1862	4 1	1 1	3 —	—		
969	1889	1855	7	1	6	—	{ Husband Wife .	1843 1844	4 10	1 1	3 9	—	Niece	
970	1889	1885	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1859 1859	1 9	1 1	8 —	—	Cousin	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
{ 7 1	Scarlet fever Brain fever	Ohio Ohio	
{ B —	—	Ohio	Brother of Husb No 1024 Not deaf
{ — B	—	Ohio	Not deaf Deserted his wife shortly after marriage Died 1887
{ 3 B	Fever	Ohio Ohio	Sister of Husb No 2912, Husb. No 2951 Parents second cousins
{ 12 11	Sickness Fever	Ohio Ohio	
{ 2½ 1	Spotted fever Catarrhal fever	Pa Pa	
{ B B	Gather'g in head	Ohio Ohio	First marriage, second to Wife No 952 Second marriage, first to Husb No 2508 Died 1882
{ B 3	Scarlet fever	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 951 Sister of Wife No 3164
{ B B		Hamil'n & Ont Ont	Parents cousins
{ 14 2	Suppuration Whooping cough	Ohio Ohio	Sister of Wife No 959.
{ 6 Inf	Diphtheria Canker	— Horace Mann	Educated in common schools
{ ½ B	Fall from horse	Ohio Ohio	Died 1839. Grandparents and parents cousins
{ B B		Pa Pa	Mother of Husb, No 1117 Died 1860.
{ B 1	Brain fever	Ohio & Ky N Y	Died 1890
{ 3 3	Scarlet fever Cold with measles	Pa Ohio	Died 1894 Sister of Wife No. 954 Second marriage; first to Husb No 2217
{ B		Pa Pa	Mother of Wife No 3816.
{ — B	—	Pa	Not deaf. Sister of Wife No 3806, Wife No. 1775
{ 4 5	Measles Scarlet fever	Wis & Coll H'fd, Tenn, Kendall,	First marriage, second to Wife No. 963. Died 1884.
{ 4 2	Measles Cold	Wis & Coll Va. & N. C.	Second marriage; first to Wife No. 962. Parents cousins
{ 1½ 3	Catarrhal fever Fever	Md Md	
{ ½ 1½	Fits when teeth'g Fall	Hartford. Clarke	Died 1889 Parents cousins Sister of Husb. No 2828.
{ 3 3½	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever.	England Minn	
{ 4 2	Spotted fever Brain fever.	Minn Hartford	
{ B 2	Inflam of brain	Minn Minn	
{ 14 18	Scarlet fever. Gradual decay...	Ill ... Ill....	Grandmother, mother, and 2 uncles became deaf after 40
{ ½	..... Lung fever.....	Nova Scotia. Minn. ....	

*Tabular Statement of Marriages.*

### MARRIAGES.

### PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children.				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives. [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown	
971	1894	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1864	2 3	2 2	1 —	—	.....
972	1890	1882	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1857	2 3	1 1	1 2	—	=====
973	1889	1879	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1857	4 6	1 —	3 6	—	=====
974	1891	1886	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1861 Wife	1 2	1 8	— —	2	.....
975	1889	1876	5	—	4	1	{ Husband 1844 Wife	2 6	1 —	7 4	—	Parents (No 976); aunt (Wife No 3531); cousin.
976	1889	1850	6	—	4	2	{ Husband 1827 Wife 1823	4 10	2 1	2 9	—	Cousin .....
977	1894	1888	3	2	—	1	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1865	1 6	1 2	— 4	—	.....
978	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1863	8 1	4 1	4 —	—	2 second cousins ..
979	1889	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife	8 1	4 1	4 —	—	2 second cousins, ..
980	1889	1879	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1856	8 9	4 1	4 8	—	2 second consins ..
981	1892	1889	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1862	16 3	1 1	15 2	—	=====
982	1889	1862	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1826 Wife 1830	8 4	2 4	6 —	—	2 nephews (Husb. No 3315 is one)
983	1890	1872	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1842	9 3	4 1	5 2	—	.....
984	1889	—	2	2	—	—	{ Husband 1820 Wife	1 —	1 —	— —	—	.....
985	1890	—	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife	12 —	3 —	9 —	—	.....
986	1890	1885	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1857	12 9	3 1	9 8	—	.....
987	1889	1881	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1855	3 3	1 1	2 2	—	Cousin (Wife No. 252)
988	1889	1860	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1841	10 5	1 1	9 4	—	.....
989	1893	1889	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1868	5 2	1 1	4 1	—	.....
990	1890	1890	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1857	13 12	1 1	12 11	—	=====
991	1893	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1862	13 5	3 4	10 1	—	Cousin .....
992	1890	1884	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1862	13 7	1 2	12 5	—	.....
993	1890	1846	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1821 Wife 1822	12 5	1 1	11 4	—	.....
994	1890	—	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1810	1 4	1 1	— 3	—	.....
							{ Husband 1822 Wife 1822	1 1	1 1	— —	—	Cousin (Wife No 3579) .....

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
971	{ 1 3	Whooping cough Lung fever	Iowa & Coll Iowa	
972	{ 5 7	Scarlet fever Meningitis	N Y Hartford	
973	{ 10 —	Fever	Hartford	Not deaf
974	{ 10 —	Typhoid fever	N Y Impr'd	Not deaf
975	{ 5 —	Paralysis	Pa	Not deaf
976	{ B 2	Convulsions	Pa Pa	Parents cousins. Brother of Wife No 3531 Mother of Wife No 975
977	{ B 8	Scarlet fever	N Y & N Y Imp N Y	
978	{ B B		Iowa Iowa	Bro of Husb No 980 1st marriage; 2d to Wife No 979 Parents third cousins. Died a year after marriage
979	{ B —		Iowa Iowa	Bro of Husb No 980 2d marriage; 1st to Wife No 978 Second marriage, first to Husb No 4379
980	{ B 2	Scarlet fever	Iowa Iowa	Brother of Husb No 978 Divorced 1887
981	{ 3 4	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Ill Ill	
982	{ B B		Ohio. Ohio	Sister of Wife No 3317, Husb No 2717, Husb No. 2508
983	{ B 4	Measles.	Pa Pa	Brother of Husb No 930 and Wife No. 3441.
984	{ — —		— —	Uneducated Dead Not deaf Mother of Wife No 2266 Dead
985	{ B —		Ohio —	First marriage; 2d to Wife No 986 Bro of Husb No. 1069 Not deaf
986	{ B 8	Spinal fever	Ohio. Ind	2d marriage, 1st to Wife No 985 Bro of Husb No 1069
987	{ 1 1	Scarlet fever Brain fever	N Y N Y	
988	{ 1 1/2 3	Gathering in head A cold	Ohio. Ohio	Died 1864 Dead.
989	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Sickness	Ohio. Ohio.	Divorced 1892 First marriage; second to Wife No 1103
990	{ 4 B	Fever	Hartford Hartford	
991	{ 2+ B	Typhoid fever	Ohio Ohio.	Brother of Wife No. 863 Died 1893 Sister of Husb. No 4283.
992	{ 3 B	Accident.	Montreal, Male Montreal, Fern	Parents cousins
993	{ Inf. 4 1/2	Illness Ulcers in head	Hartford Hartford	Died 1839 Died 1854.
994	{ — 2		— Hartford	Uneducated.
995	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Chills and fever	Mo. Mo.	



*Tabular Statement of Marriages.*

MARRIAGES				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.								
Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children )
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown	
997	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1866	11 1	4 1	7 —	—	—
998	1890 1870	1	—	1	—	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1846	5 5	1 1	4 4	—	—
999	1892	5	—	1	4	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1863	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1000	1890 1871	2	2	—	—	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1849	1 2	1 1	1 —	—	—
1001	1893	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1843	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1002	1891 1880	1	—	—	1	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1866	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1003	1894 1891	2	—	1	1	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1862	4 6	1 3	3 3	—	Second cousin
1004	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1848	1 2	1 2	—	—	—
1005	1890 1879	1	—	1	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1842	1 3	1 3	—	—	—
1006	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1820 Wife 1819	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1007	1890 1872	1	—	1	—	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1850	5 1	2 1	3 —	—	Cousin
1008	1890	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1860	11 —	1 —	10 —	—	—
1009	1892 1892	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1865	1 2	1 1	2 1	—	—
1010	1893	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1011	1890 1840	4	—	4	—	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife 1815	3 3	1 1	2 2	—	—
1012	1891 1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1869	8 1	1 1	7 —	—	—
1013	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1849	5 —	1 —	4 —	—	—
1014	1893 1888	2	—	1	1	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1870	4 7	2 1	2 6	—	—
1015	1893	6	1	5	—	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1848	6 3	3 3	3 —	—	Grandm'r; 2 great-uncles, 5 nephews and nieces
1016	1892	1	—	1	—	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1857	6 1	3 1	3 —	—	Grandm'r, 2 great-uncles; 6 nephews and nieces
1017	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1830 Wife 1830	3 7	1 2	2 5	—	—
1018	1892	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1859	6 1	1 1	5 —	—	—
1019	1890 1853	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1815	10 —	1 —	9 —	—	—
1020	1892	2	—	2	—	—	{ Husband 1811 Wife 1807	2 8	1 1	1 7	—	—
1021	1891	1	—	—	1	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1862	1 1	1 1	—	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
997 {	B 2	Scarlet fever	Kendall Kendall	
998 {	B B		Tenn Tenn	Parents cousins
999 {	2 1	Scarlet fever Spinal meningitis	Ill & N Y la	
1000 {	2 B	Inflam Rheum	Hartford Hartford.	Died 1888
1001 {			N J (?)	Insane
1002 {	12	Spinal fever	la la & So Dak	
1003 {	8 2	Cerebro-sp men A fall	Le Conteuix, Ind & College Ind	Sister of Husb No. 3627
1004 {	B (1) 1/2	Inflammation	Ind Ind	Sister of Husb No 1802
1005 {	5 5	Brain fever Cholera	Ill Ill	Parents cousins
1006 {	1 1/2	Gather'g in head	N Y N Y	
1007 {	B 3	Scarlet fever	Kendall Kendall	Brother of Wife No 2774 Died 1878
1008 {	—	Scarlet fever	Ala —	Not deaf
1009 {	2	Diphtheria. Spinal meningitis	Ill, Tex & Kan Ill & Kans	
1010 {			Mich (?)	
1011 {	1 1/2 12	Fever Measles	Hartford Hartford	Died 1887 Died 1885
1012 {	7 (10) 1/2	Catarrh.	Pa Clarke	
1013 {	1 1/2	Cold in head	Pa .	Died 1890
1014 {	B (1) 1/2	Rising in ear	Ala Ala	Parents cousins
1015 {	B B	. . .	Ga . . Ga	Bro of Husb No. 1016 and Husb No 1028 Parents second cousins.
1016 {	B 3	Rising in head	Ga Ga	Brother of Husb No 1015 and Husb No. 1028 Dead Parents second cousins
1017 {	B B	. . .	Hartford Hartford	Died 1866.
1018 {	5 .. ..	Brain fever .. ..	N. Y N Y. . . .	Insane.
1019 {	— 1 1/2	Illness & calomel	Hartford .	Not deaf Died 1853 or 1854.
1020 {	B 2	. . . . Spotted fever	Hartford .. Hartford ..	Died 1892.
1021 {	4 .. . . .	Brain fever .. . . .	N Y . . . . C N. Y . . .	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children ]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1022	1890	1880	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1831	3 9	1 1	2 8	—	—
1023	1890	1877	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1859	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1024	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1831 Wife	10 —	3 —	7 —	—	Nephew (Husb No 832); uncle
1025	1891	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1831 Wife	10 1	3 1	7 1	—	Nephew (Husb No 832) uncle.
1026	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1870	3	1	2	—	—
1027	1892	—	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife	1	1	—	—	—
1028	1892	1869	7	5	2	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1847	6 11	3 3	3 8	—	Grandm'r, 2 great-uncles, 1 nephew or niece 3d cousin, 2 nephews or nieces
1029	1892	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife	5 4	1 4	4 —	—	—
1030	1890	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife	7 1	1 1	6 —	—	—
1031	1893	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1856	1 3	1 1	— 2	—	—
1032	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1859	1 1	1 1	— —	—	—
1033	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1796 Wife	1	1	—	—	—
1034	1890	1885	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1802 Wife 1864	3 5	1 1	2 4	—	—
1035	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1816 Wife	1	1	—	—	—
1036	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1866	1 5	1 2	— 3	—	—
1037	1898	1891	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1867	1 4	1 1	— 3	—	—
1038	1894	1858	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1831 Wife 1829	13 9	1 4	12 5	—	—
1039	1894	1892	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1864	3 8	1 2	2 6	—	Cousin
1040	1891	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1861	1 2	1 1	— 1	—	—
1041	1890	—	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1842	1 7	1 1	— 6	—	—
1042	1889	1886	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1855	1 1	1 1	— —	—	—
1043	1889	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife	1	1	—	—	—
1044	1894	1892	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1868	1 3	1 1	— 2	—	—
1045	1892	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife	1 1	1 1	— —	—	—
1046	1891	—	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1 1	— 1	— —	—	—

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

221

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Index number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
1022	{ B	Inflam in head	Hartf'd & Coll Hartford	Died 1889
1023	{ 7 5	Scarlet fever Spotted fever	Ia Ia	
1024	{ B —	—	Ind	First marriage, second to Wife No 1025 Bro of Husb No 946 Divorced one or two days after marriage Dead Not deaf
1025	{ B	—	Ind	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1024 Bro of Husb No 946 Dead, semi-mute Dead.
1026	{ — B	—	Ark	Not deaf.
1027	{ J	Typhus fever	Ind	Not deaf
1028	{ B B	—	Ga Ga	Parents second cousins Bro of Husb No 1015 and Husb No 1016 Sis of Husb No 2726 and Wife No 3417 Parents cousins
1029	{ B	—	Pa Germany (?)	Separated 1890 Sister of Husb No 1530.
1030	{ B	—	Hartford	
1031	{ 2	Nervous fever	Ohio	Divorced First marriage, second to Husb No 2062
1032	{ 7	Spotted fever.	Ia	
1033	{	—	N Y	Dead
1034	{ 3 4	Brain fever Spotted fever	Ia & Ill Pa & Ia	
1035	{	Sickness	N Y	
1036	{ B	—	Halifax (?) Hartford	Sister of Wife No 1066
1037	{ 4 2	Brain fr, quinine Spinal meningitis	Ill & Coll Ill	
1038	{ 11½ B	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford.	Died 1894 Sister of Wife No 2756
1039	{ 12 B	Spotted fever	Ohio & Coll Miss	
1040	{ B J	Brain fever	Hartford Hartford	
1041	{ 1 4	Spinal meningitis Sickness	Ill Ill.	Died 1880, First marriage, second to Husb. No. 1872.
1042	{ 11 B	Quinine	Mo Pa	
1043	{ B	—	N. Y.	
1044	{ B	Sickness	N Y	
1045	{ 12½ B	Sickness	N Y, & C N Y	
1046	{ — 3½	— Fever	Ind. N. Y.	Not deaf

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

M		PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.										
Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1047	1890	2				2	{ Husband 1814 Wife 1820	6 11	3 2	2 3	1 —	
1048	1891	1				1	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1858	1 4	1 1	3 —	— —	
1049	1890	3	—	3	—		{ Husband 1810 Wife 1811	8 6	1 1	7 5	—	Grandmother
1050	1890 1836	6	—	4	2		{ Husband Wife 1812	4	1	3	—	
1051	1891 1852	2	—	2	—		{ Husband 1831 Wife 1813	1 1	1 1			
1052	1893	3	—	3	—		{ Husband Wife 1799	3	3	—	—	
1053	1890 1886	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1850 Wife 1861	2 3	2 1	— 2	—	Parents (No. 1055), uncle; 2 aunt (Wife No 790 and Wife No 1710)
1054	1890 1882	2	—	2	—		{ Husband Wife 1857	4 4	— 1	4 3	—	1st Cousin (Wife No 1054)
1055	1894	2	2	—	—		{ Husband 1814 Wife 1819	6 5	4 1	2 4	—	
1056	1891	2				2	{ Husband 1850 Wife	2	2			
1057	1890	1	—	1	—		{ Husband 1861 Wife	1 1	1 1			
1058	1890 1864	2	—	2	—		{ Husband 1840 Wife 1842	1 3?	1 1	— 2?	—	
1059	1890	5	—	5	—		{ Husband 1851 Wife 1850	1 1	1 1			
1060	1890	sev	—	all	—		{ Husband 1840 Wife	3	3			
1061	1890						{ Husband 1840 Wife 1854	3 1	3 1			
1062	1891 1891	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1872 Wife 1874	5 1	1 1	4 —	—	
1063	1892 1874	1				1	{ Husband Wife 1849	1 1	1 1			
1064	1894 1886	3		1	2		{ Husband 1857 Wife 1863	3 3	2 2	1 1	—	
1065	1892 1892	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1864 Wife 1870	1 4	1 1	3 —	—	
1066	1891 1891	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1843 Wife 1862	1 5	1 2		3	
1067	1889						{ Husband 1862 Wife 1866	5 5	1 1	4 4	—	
1068	1890 1863	1	—	1	—		{ Husband 1862 Wife	1 7	1 —	— 7	—	
1069	1892						{ Husband 1825 Wife 1824	12 1	3 1	9 —	—	
1070	1890 1871	—	—	—	—		{ Husband 1845 Wife 1848	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
							{ Husband	1	1			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
147	{ 13 15	Whooping cough	Hartford Hartford	Died previous to 1851 Sister of Wife No. 795 and Wife No 1770.
148	{ 5 (4) 1/2	Brain fever Water on the b'n	Kendall & Coll N Y & Le Cou- teux	
149	{ 1	Spotted fever	Hartford Hartford	Died 1865
150	{ — B	—	Hartford	Not deaf Died 1877
151	{ B	.	N Y N Y	Second marriage Dead.
152	{ — B	—	Hartford.	Not deaf Died 1893. Sister of Wife No. 2263
153	{ B 3	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford, Whip- ple, Claibe	Brother of Wife No 328.
154	{ — 6	Scarlet fever	Wis	Partially deaf from scarlet fever at 13 years Educated in hearing schools Married her cousin
155	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Brother of Wife No 790 and Wife No 1710 Died 1884 Mother of Wife No 328 and Husb No 1053 Died 1894
156	{ B		Pa	
157	{ B		Wis	Not born deaf Dead.
158	{ 2 3	Inflam of brain Brain fever	N Y N Y	
159	{ 6 1	Brain fever Fright		
160	{ B —		Ill —	First marriage, second to Wife No 1061 Divorced Bro. of Wife No. 4010 Not deaf
161	{ B		Ill Ill	Brother of Wife No 4010 Second marriage, first to Wife No 1060
162	{ B 2	Measles.	W N Y W N Y	Parents second cousins
163	{ 1 1/2	Inflam. of brain	N. Y	....
164	{ B B		N Y N Y	Brother of Wife No 1900
165	{ 1 1/2 (Inf	Convulsions Cerebro-sp men	Mo St. Louis Day	Twin brother born hearing.
166	{ 8 2	Scrofula Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Wife No 1086.
167	{ 1 6	Inflam'n of ears. Scarlet fever	Mich Mich	
168	{ B —	... ..	Ill & Neb —	Not deaf. Died about 1885
169	{ B 1 1/2	... .. Inflam of brain	Ohio . Ohio.	Brother of Husb No 985
170	{ B 1	... .. Inflam. in head.	Hartford . Hartford	4 ..
171	{ — 3	... .. Scarlet fever	Halifax . Hartford	First marriage; second to Wife No 1072. Died 1896 Parents cousins

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES.				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]				
	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children			Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son record.d.]						
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.		Total	Deaf		Hearing	Unknown.		
1072	1892	1892	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife		1	1				
1073	1891	1888	1		1	{ Husband Wife	1857 1863	2 7	2 1	6	—		
1074	1893	1885	3	—	1	2	{ Husband Wife	1858 1882	3 9	1 2	7	—	
1075	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1867 1866	1 2	1 2			
1076	1890		6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife		1 6	1 —	6	—	Parents (No 707) ; 4 second cousins
1077	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1866 1870	1 1	1 1	—	—	Second cousins
1078	1892						{ Husband Wife		2	1		1	
1079	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			....
1080	1889	1887	1		1		{ Husband Wife	1852 1857	4 3	2 1	2	—	2 nieces and 2 nephews
1081	1890						{ Husband Wife	1866 1869	1 4	1 1	3	—	..
1082	1892		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1865	2 3	2 1	2	—	
1083	1890						{ Husband Wife		1 2	1 2			
1084	1893		2		2		{ Husband Wife	1857	1 1	1 1			—
1085	1890		sev	—	all	—	{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			
1086	1890	1876	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1834 1850	1 1	1 1			—
1087	1891	1879	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1834 1856	1 1	1 1			—
1088	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1846 1855	5 4	4 1	1 3	—	..
1089	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife		1 2	1 1	1	—	..
1090	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1866 1870	11 6	1 1	10 5	—	—
1091	1893	1886	1		1		{ Husband Wife	1860 1861	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	....
1092	1891	1889	1		1		{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			
1093	1893						{ Husband Wife	1848	4	1	3	—	Second cousin .
1094	1892	1882	1		1		{ Husband Wife	1848 1854	4 9	1 4	3 5	—	Second cousin, —
1095	1891	1884	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1857 1862	9 1	1 1	8	—	Cousin ; uncle
1096	1893		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			..

Deaf Relatives  
[Not including brothers and sisters  
nor children]

Parents (No 707) ; 4 second cousins

Second cousins

2 nieces and 2 nephews

Second cousin.

Second cousin.

Cousin ; uncle

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
172 {			Halifax	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1071
173 { B			N Y	Died 1891
173 { B			N Y	First marriage, second to Husb No 572
174 { 3	Scarlet fever	N Y		
174 { B		N Y		Parents cousins
175 { 14	Run over by	Mich		
175 { 2	thresh'g machine illness	Mich		
176 { —	—	Scotland		Not deaf Second marriage
177 { B	Fall, chills & fev,	Colo		
177 { 1	Sp meningitis	Ill, Neb, Colo		
178 {		Ohio (?)		
179 {				
180 { B	Whooping cough	N Y		Brother of Wife No 450
180 { 1 1/2	& cong'n of brain	N Y		
181 { 4	Brain fever	Le Conteuix		
181 {		Mich		
182 { B		N Y & Coll		Died 1892
182 { 1 1/2		Hartford		
183 { B		Ireland (?)		
183 {		N Y.		
184 { 3	Mumps, measles,	Mo & Ia		
184 {	& whoop'g cough			
185 { —	—	—		Not deaf
185 { 4	Inflam of brain	Ill		
186 { B	Sickness	N Y		First marriage, second to Wife No 1087 Died 1880
186 {		Ohio		Died 1878
187 { B		N Y		Second marriage, first to Wife No 1086 Died 1890
187 {		N Y		
188 { B		Pa.		Second marriage; first to Wife No 940 Brother of Wife
188 { 1 1/2	Convulsions.	Pa		No. 3 and Wife No 2757. Parents cousins
189 { B	Dropsy of head.	Ky		
189 {		Ky		
190 { 2 1/2	Meningitis. ....	Ga. ....		
190 { 4	Meningitis ....	Ga		Parents third cousins. Sister of Husb. No. 546
191 { 2 1/2	Typhoid fever .	Mo. & Coll.		
191 { 12	Cerebro-sp men	Ill		
192 {		Pa?		
192 {		....		
193 { B		Pa		First marriage; second to Wife No. 1094
193 {		....		Dead.
194 { B		Pa		Second marriage; first to Wife No. 1093.
194 { B		N. Y. ....		Sister of Wife No 1394
195 { 3	Grain in ears.	Ia		
195 { 3	Brain fever.....	Ia		
196 { —	—	—		Not deaf.
196 {	Cerebro-sp men	Pa		



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1097	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1852	10 7	4 1	6 6	—	Consins, niece, nephews (?)
1098	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			
1099	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			
1100	1891	1886					{ Husband 1862 Wife	1 1	1 1			
1101	1893	1892	1		1		{ Husband 1864 Wife 1872	2 1	1 1	1 —	—	Uncle (Husb No 137d)
1102	1890		3	1	2	—	{ Husband 1831 Wife 1835	1 1	1 1			Second cousin
1103	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife	5 1	1 1	4 —	—	
1104	1890	1863	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife 1841	1 2	1 2			
1105	1892		1		1		{ Husband 1868 Wife	1 1	1 1			
1106	1890						{ Husband Wife 1820	1 2	1 2			
1107	1893	1848	11	—	11	—	{ Husband 1815 Wife	2	1	1	—	
1108	1894	1878	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1818 Wife 1856	1 4	1 1	3 —	—	
1109	1892	1891	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1869 Wife 1873	6 4	1 4	5 —	—	Parents (No 4331), 6 aunts (includ Wife No 3355, Wife No 2461; W No 2902, Wife No 3141, Wife 1839), uncle (Husb No 139) and c sib
1110	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife	1	1			
1111	1892	1891	1		1		{ Husband 1867 Wife 1866	1 1	1 1			Aunt
1112	1891		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1845	1 4	1 1	3 —	—	
1113	1894	1865					{ Husband 1829 Wife	1 1	1 1			
1114	1894	1881					{ Husband 1829 Wife	1 1	1 1			
1115	1894	1893					{ Husband 1868 Wife 1860	6 4	1 1	5 3	—	
1116	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1857	1 1	1 1			
1117	1894						{ Husband 1868 Wife	1	1	—	—	Parents (No 957), aunt or uncle
1118	1894	..					{ Husband 1863 Wife 1863	1 2	1 2			Great-uncle; great-aunt
1119	1894	1893					{ Husband Wife 1869	1 1	1 1	—	—	
1120	1894	1893	1		1		{ Husband 1864 Wife 1873	6 4	1 2	5 2	—	2 cousins .....
1121	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife	1 1	1 1			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
77 { B 10	Typhoid fever.	Le Couteulx Minn	Brother of Husb No 943.
78 { 13			
79 { —	—	Ky —	Not deaf
80 { —	—	Texas —	Not deaf
81 { 13 13	Humor	Hartford Portland	
82 { B B		Ill Ill	Died 1865. Died 1865
83 { 14		Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 989
84 {	Fever	Wis Ind	
85 { 13	Spinal meningitis	Ky	
86 { B B		N Y N Y	Sister of Wife No 2629
87 { Inf —	Sickness	Ohio —	Died 1893 Not deaf
88 { 12 12	Tething Inflam of brain	N Y. N Y	
89 { 14 B	Accident	Pa Pa	Paternal grandparents were second cousins Sister of Wife No 1593
90 { 9 —	Sickness	Mo —	Not deaf.
91 { B 4	Scarlet fever.	No N Y. No. N Y ..	
92 { 2	A fall	Paris H'fd & N Y.	
93 { B		N Y	First marriage; second to Wife No 1114 Dead.
94 { B	..	N Y .... N Y ? . . . .	Second marriage; first to Wife No 1113 Dead
95 { 4 3	Brain fever .. Typhoid fever	Md & Kendall Md .	
96 { 4 7	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Ind. .... Ind . . . . .	
97 { B —	—	Le Couteulx..	Not deaf
98 { 3 B	Sickness ..	Ill Ill	Parents third cousins
99 { 5	Meningitis..	Ga. ....	
100 { 6 B	Meningitis . . . .....	N. Y . . . . . Ark . . . . .	
101 { 14	Dropey of brain	Ill., Wis. & St John's	

MARRIAGES.						PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE								
Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives. [Not including brothers and sisters nor children ]		
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.			
1122	1891						{Husband 1851 Wife	1	1					
1123	1899						{Husband 1849 Wife	1 1	1 1					
1124	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1868 Wife	7 3	1 1	6 2	—			
1125	1894						{Husband 1840 Wife	3	1	2	—	3 third cousins		
1126	1889		2	—	2	—	{Husband 1846 Wife	5 5	1 1	4 4	—			
1127	1890	1882	3	—	2	1	{Husband 1854 Wife	2 5	1 2	1 3	—			
1128	1880						{Husband 1869 Wife	4	4	—	—			
1129	1889	1885	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1856 Wife	2 4	1 1	1 3	—			
1130	1889	1876	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1844 Wife	11 4	2 1	9 3	—	2 great-aunts		
1131	1890	1884	1	—	—	1	{Husband 1844 Wife	11 8	2 3	9 5	—	2 great-aunts		
1132	1889	1881	3	—	—	3	{Husband 1858 Wife	4 7	1 2	3 5	—			
1133	1892	1882	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1856 Wife	5 5	1 3	4 2	—			
1134	1892	1879	3	—	2	1	{Husband 1845 Wife	11 6	1 2	10 4	—			
1135	1892	1887	3	—	1	2	{Husband 1863 Wife	1 2	1 1	1 1	—	Parents (No 168), uncle (Husb No. 295), aunt 2 relatives.		
1136	1889	1880	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1836 Wife	2 9	1 1	1 8	—			
1137	1889	1880	3	—	3	—	{Husband 1852 Wife	5 7	1 1	4 6	—			
1138	1889	1885	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1860 Wife	3 10	1 1	2 9	—			
1139	1891	1888	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1863 Wife	5 8	3 3	2 5	—			
1140	1890	1881	4	—	4	—	{Husband 1861 Wife	5 9	3 2	3 7	—			
1141	1889	1873	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1845 Wife	8 10	2 1	6 9	—	2 cousins		
1142	1889	1876	3	—	3	—	{Husband 1848 Wife	9 4	2 1	7 3	—	Aunt		
1143	1889	1878	3	—	3	—	{Husband 1853 Wife	4 4	1 1	3 3	—			
1144	1889	1889	1	—	—	1	{Husband 1860 Wife	3 7	1 1	2 6	—	Second cousin		
1145	1889	1877	1	—	1	—	{Husband 1857 Wife	1 7	1 1		6	—		
1146	1889	.....	1	—	1	—	{Husband Wife	2 1	2 1					

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
1122 {	3	Cerebral mening's	Wis.	
1123 {	9	Cold	Ind	
1124 {	5	Spotted fever	Pa & Coll	
1124 {	5	Spotted fever	Pa & Coll	
1125 {	13	Canker rash	Hartford	Died 1894 Not deaf
1126 {	6	Scarlet fever	Pa	
1126 {	B	..	Pa	
1127 {	1 1/2	Mumps	Ill	
1127 {	B		Ill	
1128 {	—	—	Md	Not deaf
1128 {	B			
1129 {	8	Spotted fever	Pa & Coll	
1129 {	5		Pa	
1130 {	2	Scald head	Wis & Coll	First marriage, 2d to Wife No 1131, 3d to Wife No 1199
1130 {	B	Scarlet fever	Wis	Died 1879
1131 {	2	Scald head	Wis & Coll	Second marriage, 1st to Wife No 1130, 3d to Wife No. 1199
1131 {	B		Ind	Parents cousins Sister of Wife No 3978 Died 1886
1132 {	12 1/2	Spasms	Hartford & Pa	Parents cousins
1132 {	3	Scarlet fever	W Pa	
1133 {	2 1/2	Scarlet fever	Ohio	
1133 {	B		Ohio	Sister of Wife No 1887
114 {		Inflam & paral of audit nerve	Ohio.	
114 {	B		Ohio	
115 {	9	Whooping cough	Ohio	
115 {	B		Ohio	
116 {		Scarlet fever	Ohio	Died 1862
116 {			Ohio	First marriage; second to Husb No 1597
117 {	B		Ohio	
117 {	5	Intermit fever	Ohio	
118 {	11	Menigitis	W N Y	
118 {	6	Spotted fever	W N Y	
119 {	B		Ark	Brother of Husb No. 1140
119 {	B		St Louis (Day)	
120 {	3	Typhoid fever	Ark	Brother of Husb No 1139
120 {	B		Ark.	
121 {	2 1/2	Erysipelas	Ohio	Died 1873
121 {	2	Dropey of head	Ohio	
122 {	B		Kendall	Parents second cousins
122 {	7	Scarlet fever	Kendall	Died 1899.
123 {	2	Fall	N Y	
123 {	2	Scarlet fever.	N Y	.....
124 {	2		Clarke	
124 {	1 1/2	Fall.	Clarke	
125 {				Died 1878
125 {	13	Scarlet fever	Minn	
126 {			Pa	Left his wife Brother of Husb. No. 1147.
126 {			Pa.	Third marriage; first to Husb. No 4334; second to Husb.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Per-son recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown.			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown.	
1148	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1860	4	1	3	—	—
1149	1889	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1801 1812	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1150	1889	1880	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1850	11 4	1 1	10 3	—	Father's cousin (Husb No 2051)
1151	1889	1861	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1831 1827	9 7	4 3	5 4	—	—
1152	1889	1874	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1831 1829	9 6	4 1	5 5	—	3 cousins
1153	1890	1874	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1851	7	3	4	—	4 cousins (including Wife No. 38 Husb No 2222), 2 second cousin (Wife No. 3952 is one)
1154	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1868	8 4	2 1	6 3	—	A cousin
1155	1890	1872	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1846 1849	12 13	1 1	11 12	—	—
1156	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1846 1856	12 13	1 3	11 10	—	—
1157	1894	1889	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1863 8	15 8	1 1	14 7	—	—
1158	1890	1868	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1830 1839	6 5	1 1	5 4	—	—
1159	1893	1	—	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1867	2 2	1 2	1	—	—
1160	1892	sev	—	all	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1854	1	1	—	—	—
1161	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1810	2	1	1	—	—
1162	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1163	1892	1890	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1866 1868	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1164	1891	1862	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1839	1	1	—	—	—
1165	1890	9	27	7	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1	—	—	—	—
1166	1891	1884	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1851 1864	11 7	4 1	7 6	—	Niece or nephew
1167	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1853 1862	1 8	1 1	—	—	—
1168	1893	1	1	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1846	3 1	3 1	—	—	—
1169	1890	1863	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1833 1836	3 6	3 2	—	—	3 cousins
1170	1890	1	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1	—	—	—	—
1171	1890	sev.	—	all	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1844	3 1	3 1	—	—	3 cousins
1172	1894	1855	5	2	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1820	1	1	—	—	—

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

231

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
148	{ 2½ —	Brain fever	Pa ———	Not deaf
149	{ 1	Whooping cough	Pa Pa .	
150	{ 7 1	Cong'n of brain White swelling on neck	N Y N Y	
151	{ 2 2	Cold .. . .	N Y. N. Y	Parents cousins First marriage, second to Wife No. 1152 Sister of Husb No 2497
152	{ 2 2	Gather'g in head.	N Y N Y . . . .	Parents cousins Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1151.
153	{ — B	.. ———	Ohio .....	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 2244, Husb. No 2221 Cousin of Wife No 558
154	{ B 5	Spinal meningitis	Mo. Mo . . . .	
155	{ 3 9	Fever .. . . Inflammation	Mich Mich .	First marriage; second to Wife No. 1155 Died 1882
156	{ 3 B	Fever	Mich Mich	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1155 Sister of Wife No 1277.
157	{ 18 B	Mumps ... ..	Miss Miss .. .	
158	{ B B	.. . .	Manchester Hartford . .	Second marriage, first to Husb No 2974.
159	{ — (2½	Diphtheria	Cal ———	Not deaf
160	{ — —	.. ..	Texas ———	Not deaf.
161	{ B —	.. ..	Hartford ———	Not deaf
162	{ — .....	.. ..	Wis . Wis .....	
163	{ 6 5	Spotted fever Spotted fever	Pa . . . . . Pa. & Coll	
164	{ — 3	.. .. A fall	.. .. N. Y. & O .	Not deaf
165	{ — —	.. ..	———	Not deaf
166	{ B 3	.. .. Spotted fever	Ia ..... Ia	Brother of Wife No 1671.
167	{ 3 B	.. ..	Ia Kans . . . .	
168	{ B —	.. ..	N Y. .... N. Y .....	
169	{ B B	.. ..	Ill . . . . Ill ... . .	Brother of Wife No 318 and Husb. No 1171. Parents cousins Died 1875. First marriage; second to Husb. No 2553 Sister of Wife No 1797.
170	{ — —	.. ..	.. ..	Mother of Wife No 3481. Not deaf.
171	{ B —	.. ..	Ill. .... Ill. .	Parents cousins Brother of Husb. No. 1169, and Wife No. 318.
172	{ B B	.. ..	Pa Ill	Mother of Husb No 1177 and Wife No 1609

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1173	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	6 3	2 —	4 3	—	
1174	1889		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1866	1 1	1 1	—	—	
1175	1891		5	1	4	—	{ Husband 1824 Wife 1830	5 9	1 3	4 6	—	Father partially; second cousins
1176	1890						{ Husband 1865 Wife	1	1	—	—	
1177	1890	1882	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1854	5 4	2 1	3 3	—	Parents (No 1172)
1178	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife	2 4	1 4	1 —	—	
1179	1890	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1887 Wife 1890	7 1	2 1	5 —	—	3 nieces and nephews (Wife No 926, Wife No 3198)
1180	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1867	5 7	1 1	4 6	—	Uncle (Husb No 3565), mother
1181	1894	1881	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1856	6 4	2 1	4 3	—	
1182	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1864 Wife 1865	1 6	1 1	— 5	—	
1183	1890	1872					{ Husband 1849 Wife 1848	8 1	2 1	6 —	—	
1184	1890	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife	6 5	2 1	4 4	—	
1185	1890	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1866	6 7	2 1	4 6	—	
1186	1890		3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1852	1 6	1 4	— 2	—	2 nephews or nieces
1187	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife 1827	11 6	1 2	10 4	—	
1188	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1189	1891	1876					{ Husband 1845 Wife	4 1	1 1	3 —	—	
1190	1889		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1864	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1191	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1864	2 3	2 1	— 2	—	
1192	1890	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1865	5 7	1 1	4 6	—	
1193	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1862	13 11	1 1	12 —	—	2 cousins
1194	1890		4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife	1	1	—	—	
1195	1890	1875	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1853	6 5	2 1	4 4	—	
1196	1890	1856	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1830 Wife 1835	1 7	1 2	— 5	—	Cousin
1197	1893		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1867	4 4	1 1	3 3	—	
1198	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1871	1 1	1 1	— —	—	Some partially deaf Parents (No 4133)

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
1173	{ 6	Rising & measles	Va	Not deaf
1174	{ 1 1/2 1 1/2	Spinal disease Brain fever	Ill Ill	
1175	{ B B		Hartford Hartford	Father of Wife No 2727 Died 1880 Sister of Husb No 522, Wife No 820, Wife No 3701
1176	{ —	—	N O	Not deaf
1177	{ B 3	Sickness	Ill Ohio	Separated Brother of Wife No 1603
1178	{ B	—	Ia	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 906, Wife No 2452, Husb No 4127
1179	{ 1 B	Scarlet fever	Ind Ind	Brother of Wife No 3555
1180	{ 1 1/2 4	Brain fever Spotted fever	Pa Pa	
1181	{ 7 B	A fall . . . ..	N Y N Y	
1182	{ 1 1/2 3	Measles Typhoid fever	Mich Mich.	
1183	{ B	.	Ind Ind	Brother of Wife No 89
1184	{ B 1	Catarrh	Oregon Oregon	Brother of Husb No 1185
1185	{ B 1 1/2	Brain fever	Oregon Oregon	Brother of Husb No 1184
1186	{ 1 1/2 B	Brain fever	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Husb No 2589, Husb No 2588, Wife No 2369
1187	{ 1 1/2 B	Spotted fever .. ..	Hartford Hartford	
1188	{ . . . . . .	. . . . . .	Ont ? Ont ?	
1189	{ 1 1/2	Measles	Hartford Halifax	
1190	{ 1 1/2	Intermit fever	Ky Ky	Died 1889 First marriage, second to Husb No 807
1191	{ 5	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	
1192	{ 2 1/2 8	Typhoid fever Typhoid fever ..	Oregon Oregon	
1193	{ 1 1 1/2	Billious fever Spotted fever	Ohio Ohio	
1194	{ 4	Fall . . . . . .. .. .	— .. . . .	
1195	{ 1 1/2 2 1/2	Scarlet fever Rheumatic fever	Hartford . . Hartford ..	Brother of Wife No 373 Dead.
1196	{ 3 6	Scarlet fever. Scarlet fever ....	Ind Hartford & Ind.	
1197	{ 1 1/2 B	Black fever..... .....	C. N. Y . . . C. N. Y .....	Parents third cousins
1198	{ 5 1 1/2	Cerebro-sp. men. Measles.....	N. Y ... .. C. N. Y .	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1199	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1844	11	2	9	—	2 great-aunts . .
							{ Wife 1864	1	1			
1200	1890	1870	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1838	1	1			
							{ Wife 1861	1	1			
1201	1890						{ Husband 1815	2	2			
							{ Wife 1820	2	2			Father (Husb No 603), uncle, aunt
1202	1890	1878	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1849	2	1	1	—	
							{ Wife 1861	1	1			
1203	1890	1885					{ Husband 1862	2	1	1	—	
							{ Wife					
1204	1890	1880	4	—	3	1	{ Husband 1851	3	1	2	—	
							{ Wife 1856	5	1	4	—	Aunt (Wife No. 1250)
1205	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1864	1	1			
							{ Wife 1864	1	1			
1206	1890	1886	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856	3	1	2	—	
							{ Wife					
1207	1891		2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1857	1	1			
							{ Wife 1861	1	1			
1208	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1858	1	1			
							{ Wife					
1209	1890						{ Husband 1835	1	1			
							{ Wife					
1210	1891	1888	1			1	{ Husband 1860	5	1	4	—	
							{ Wife 1864	1	1			
1211	1892		2	1		1	{ Husband 1844	1	1			
							{ Wife 1852	1	1			
1212	1892	1889	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1863	2	1	1	—	
							{ Wife 1867	6	1	5	—	Great-aunt . .
1213	1894		3			3	{ Husband 1848	2	2			2 great-uncles . .
							{ Wife 1864	1	1			
1214	1890	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1845	1	1	—	—	Cousin (Husb No 1217) . .
							{ Wife 1859	3	1	2	—	Great-grandfather . .
1215	1890	1871					{ Husband 1849	3	1	2	—	.. ..
							{ Wife					
1216	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1849	3	1	2	—	
							{ Wife 1861	3	1	2	—	
1217	1890	1874	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1847	5	1	4	—	1 cousin (Husb No 1214); uncle; 2 aunts
							{ Wife 1847	3	2	1	—	
1218	1892		1	—	1	—	{ Husband					
							{ Wife	1	1			
1219	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1819	4	1	3	—	4 cousins (Wife No. 1219, Husb. No 4249 are included)
							{ Wife 1819	10	4	6	—	Cousin (Husb No 1219) . .
1220	1890	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband					
							{ Wife	1	1			
1221	1892	1888	2			2	{ Husband					
							{ Wife 1859	1	1			
1222	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866	1	1			
							{ Wife 1870	6	2	4	—	
223	1890	1885	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1847	1	1			
							{ Wife 1848	1	1			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
199 {	2	Scald head ....	Wis & College	Third marriage, first to Wife No 1130, second to Wife No 1131.
	8	Cerebro-sp men	Wis	
200 {	6	Fever ..	Ill. and Mo	Died 1892.
	8	Whooping cough	Mo	
201 {	B	.	O N Y & N Y	
	B	.	N Y	
202 {	B	Scarlet fever ..	N Y	
	4	.	N. Y & Ohio	
203 {	2½	Scarlet fever	Hartford	Not deaf
	—	.	.	
204 {	4	Scarlet fever	Ohio	
	B	.	Ohio, ..	
205 {	4	.	Wis	
	4	.	Wis	
206 {	5	Fall ..	Hartf'd & Coll	Hard of hearing.
	—	.	.	
207 {	1	Measles	Wis	Died 1891
	6	..	Wis.	
208 {	—	—	—	Not deaf Dead (?)
	5+	.	Oregon	
209 {	20	A rock fell on h'd	—	
	—	.	.	
210 {	B	.	Hartford	
	1½	Fever	Hartford	
211 {	B	.	Ind	Died 1884
	B	.	Ind	
212 {	4	Scarlet fever	—	Educated in public schools
	16	Catarrh	Texas	
213 {	B	.....	Ill	Died 1894.
	B	.....	Mo	
214 {	3	Scarlet fever.	N Y	Second marriage, first to Husb No 2186
	17	Gatherings, ..	Ia	
215 {	17	Brain fever ..	Hartford.	First marriage, second to Wife No 1216 Not deaf. Dead.
	—	.	.	
216 {	17	Brain fever ..	Hartford	Second marriage; first to Wife No. 1215
	17	Scald .....	Hartford	
217 {	17	Scarlet fever.	N Y	Died 1893
	B	.....	N Y ..	
218 {	—	—	—	Not deaf.
	—	.....	Tenn	
219 {	B	.....	Hartford ..	Dead.
	—	Canker rash and fall.	Hartford	
220 {	—	—	—	Not deaf Not at school First marriage; second to Husb No. 344.
	—	.....	.	
221 {	—	—	—	Not deaf Sued for divorce 1891 or 1892.
	14	Spinal meningitis	Wis. ...	
222 {	1½	Quinine or fever.	Ore, Cal., Wash	
	17	Typhoid fever	Ore ....	
223 {	1½	Scarlet fever.....	N Y .....	
	14	Scarlet fever ....	N. Y .....	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown.	
1224	1894	1893					{ Husband 1869 Wife 1866	5 1	1 1	4 —	—	—
1225	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1869	1 3	1 2	1 1	—	..
1226	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1873	5 2	1 1	4 1	—	—
1227	1894	1893					{ Husband 1861 Wife 1861	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1228	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1868	1 2	1 1	— 1	—	—
1229	1890	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1856	8 8	1 1	7 7	—	Cousin
1230	1893		2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1866	8 2	1 1	7 1	—	—
1231	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1844	9 10	4 3	5 7	—	Second cousin (Husb No 220)
1232	1890	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1841	4 9	1 1	3 8	—	—
1233	1889		8	—	8	—	{ Husband 1829 Wife 1844	2 1	1 1	1 —	—	
1234	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1829 Wife 1832	2 9	1 1	1 8	—	—
1235	1889		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1845	7 7	1 1	6 6	—	—
1236	1889	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1863	4 3	1 1	3 2	—	—
1237	1890	1885	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1864	9 9	3 1	6 8	—	Grand-uncle
1238	1889	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1850	12 7	3 1	9 6	—	—
1289	1890	1879	3	1	2	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1853	4 2	1 1	3 1	—	—
1240	1889	1878	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1861	9 6	1 1	8 5	—	Third cousin
1241	1889	1884	4	—	3	1	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1858	4 4	1 1	3 3	—	—
1242	1889	1877	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1840	7 6	1 2	6 4	—	Great-grandfather
1243	1889	1848	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife 1819	1 4	1 3	1 1	—	—
1244	1889	1834	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1862	3 2	1 —	2 2	—	—
1245	1889	1876	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1855	6 4	1 1	5 3	—	—
1246	1892	1881	4	—	3	1	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1860	3 6	1 1	2 5	—	—
1247	1890	1885	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1866	4 10	1 1	3 9	—	—
1248	1889	1880	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1826 Wife 1858	10 6	1 1	9 5	—	—
1249	1889	1886	4	—	1	3	{ Husband 1880	9	2	7	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
1224	{ 3 1/2 17	Scarlet fever Gather'gs in head	N Y N Y	Second marriage; first to Husb No 2108
1225	{ 6 1	Spotted fever Whooping cough	Ill Kans	Pa. ents third cousins
1226	{ 4 3	Spinal meningitis Scarlet fever	Kans W. N. Y	Third marriage, first to Husb No 2020, second to Husb No 3535
1227	{ 2	Int fever	Ind	
1228	{ 4	Spotted fever	Germany (?) N Y	
1229	{ 6 B	Measles	Iowa Iowa	
1230	{ 7 1 1/2	Inflam of brain Measles	Pa Pa ..	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1267.
1231	{ B B		Pa Pa	Parents 1st cousins Bro of Husb No 1268 & Wife No 940 Parents cousins Sister of Wife No 2215 Died year after marriage
1232	{ 14 13	Scarlet fever Congestive chill	Hartford .... Ill	Second marriage (?)
1233	{ 2 6	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	First marriage; second to Wife No 1234
1234	{ 2 B		Pa Pa	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1233.
1235	{ 2 3	Scarlet fever Brain fever	I'a & College Pa ..	
1236	{ 4 2 1/2	Meningitis Scarlet fever	Ill Ill.	
1237	{ B 3	Spotted fever	Pa Ky	
1238	{ B }	Scarlet fever	Neb Ill	Parents first cousins
1239	{ 7 B	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	
1240	{ 5 2	Scarlet fever Fever	Ohio Iowa	
41	{ 1 3	Gout Scarlet fever	Ohio, ... Cleveland	
42	{ 4 2	Canker rash Sickness	Ohio. Ohio.	Sister of Husb No 363*
43	{ Inf 2	Inflam of brain Accident	Ohio Ohio	Died 1887 Sister of Wife No. 2453. Died 1888.
44	{ 12 }	Scarlet fever	Ohio & W. Va	Not deaf
45	{ 1	Fever Brain fever	Ohio Ohio.	
46	{ 7 4	Typhoid fever. Spotted fever	Ohio & Coll Ohio ..	
47	{ 7	Spotted fever.	Ohio Ohio..	
48	{ B 4	Scarlet fever	Ohio Ohio.	
49	{ B }		W. Va	Brother of Husb No. 1260.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of informant	Date of marriage	No of Children.				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1250	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1864	9 9	2 1	7 8	—	— —
1251	1894	1886	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1861	8 7	1 1	7 6	—	—
1252	1890	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1864	8 6	1 2	7 4	—	—
1253	1889	1878	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1849	6 8	1 3	5 5	—	Two third cousins (Husb No 1433 and Wife No 281) 6 nephews and nieces
1254	1893		6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife	5	1	4	—	..
1255	1890	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1868	12 4	1 1	11 3	—	5th cousin
1256	1892	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife	12 12	1 1	11 11	—	.
1257	1889	1880	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1839 Wife 1859	1 1	1 1		—	..
1258	1893	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife	6 7	— 1	6 6	—	— —
1259	1890	1863	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife	5 4	1 1	4 3	—	Niece (Wife No 1204)
1260	1890	1892	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1851	5 4	1 1	4 3	—	Cousin (Wife No 1620)
1261	1892	1883	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1853	6 1	1 1	5 1	—	..
1262	1889	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1859	6 5	2 2	4 3	—	... .....
1263	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1858	8 6	1 1	7 5	—	Cousin .. .. .
1264	1890	1884	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1858	7 7	1 1	6 6	—	— —
1265	1890	1882	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1858	2 3	1 1	1 2	—	Aunt
1266	1891	1863	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1838	4 10	1 1	3 9	—	— —
1267	1889	..	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife	8	1	7	—	.. .. .
1268	1889		7	—	7	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife	9	4	5	—	.. .. . .....
1269	1889	1869	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1861	4 1	1 1	3 1	—	.. .. . .....
1270	1889	1881	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1858	9 3	1 1	8 2	—	Uncle Parents (No 129) and uncle (Husb No 126)
1271	1890	1878	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1856	5 9	1 3	4 6	—	— —
1272	1889	1876	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1847	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	— —
1273	1890	1873	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1852	9 8	1 2	8 6	—	— —
							{ Husband	7	—	7	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
260	{ B 6	Scarlet fever	W Va W Va	Brother of Husband No 1249
61	{ B 17	Scarlet fever	Horace Mann Horace Mann	
52	{ 2 B	Measles	Ohio Ky	Sister of Wife No 364.
53	{ 1 1/2 B	Brain fever	Ky Ky	Parents cousins Sister of Husband No 2476
54	{ —	—	Ohio	Not deaf
55	{ 10 1 1/2	Meningitis Diphtheria	N Y & Coll N Y	
56	{ 5 4	Brain fever Brain fever	Ontario Ontario	
157	{ Chi	Fever Scarlet fever.	Ohio Ohio	
158	{ 2	Measles & sc't fev	N Y. & W N Y	Not deaf.
259	{ 17	Inflam in head	Ohio Ohio	First marriage, second to Wife No 1278, third to Wife No 1260 Died 1890 Died 1890
260	{ 17 1 1/2	Inflam in head Gathering in head	Ohio Ohio	Third marriage, first to Wife No 1259, second to Wife No. 1278 Died 1890
261	{ 5 1 1/2	White swelling Cold	Ohio Ind	
262	{ B B	. .	Ohio Ohio	
	{ 5 8	Sickness Scarlet fever	Kans	
	{ 2 6	Scarlet fever Typhoid fever.	N Y N Y	
	{ 2 B	Measles	Hartford Clarke	
	{ Inf B	Medicine ..	Wis Hartford.	
	{ 7 —	Inflam of brain	Pa	Divorced First marriage, second to Wife No 1230 Not deaf.
	{ B —	. . .	Pa	Parents first cousins Brother of Husband, No 1231 and Wife No 940. Not deaf Second marriage, first to hearing brother of husband
	{ 1/2	Spasms	Pa Pa	
	{ 3 B	Scarlet fever. . . . .	Kendall Pa . . .	Sister of Wife No 3869
	{ 2 2	Scarlet fever. Disease in ears..	Ill & Hartford Wis .....	Sister of Husband, No. 245.
	{ 9 1 1/2	Scarlet fever . Fever .. . . .	Mich . . . Mich .....	
	{ 8 1 1/2	Scarlet fever . Measles	Ind .....	Sister of Wife No. 2239
	{ — 3	— Scarlet fever.	— Mich	Not deaf

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1275	1890	1869	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1849	7	2	4	1	
1276	1890	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1863	10	1	9	—	Nephew
1277	1890	1882	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1864	6	1	5	—	
1278	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1860	5	1	4	—	.. . . . .
1279	1891	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1827	1	1	1	—	
1280	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1858 Wife	3	1	2	—	
1281	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1844	1	1	2	—	Mother (Wife No 1282); uncle
1282	1890	—	1	1	—	—	{ Husband Wife	2	2	—	—	
1283	1892	1875	3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1844 Wife	1	1	1	—	
1284	1891	1874	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1852	1	1	7	—	
1285	1890	—	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1862	9	1	8	—	
1286	1890	1883	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife	8	2	6	—	
1287	1892	186—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1827	1	1	—	—	
1288	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife	1	1	—	—	
1289	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife	6	1	5	—	
1290	1891	—	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1	—	—	
1291	1892	—	5	—	4	1	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1858	1	1	4	—	
1292	1893	1892	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1869 Wife	9	1	8	—	
1293	1890	1869	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1847	5	1	4	—	
1294	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1866	7	2	5	—	
1295	1892	—	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1862	1	1	1	—	
1296	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1885 Wife 1838	4	2	2	—	
1297	1892	..	2	2	..	..	{ Husband 1829 Wife 1842	1	1	1	—	Nephew (Husb. No 2733) and nie (Wife No 3321).
1298	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1869	1	1	3	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
275	{ 1½ B	Chicken pox	Hartford . . . Hartford	
276	{ 2½ 10	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever.	Hartford Horace Mann	
277	{ B B		Ham'n & Mich Mich	Sister of Wife No 1156
278	{ 1½ B	Inflam in head .	Ohio Ohio	Divorced in 1882 Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1259, third to Wife No 1260 Died 1890 First marriage, second to Husb. No 1970
279	{ 1 B	Dropsy in head	Pa . . . .	
280	{ B —	—	Hartford. . .	Not deaf
281	{ ½ 2	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Hartford . . Hartford	
282	{ — 9	—	—	Not deaf Mother of Husb No. 1281.
283	{ 1 B	Sickness	N Y . . . . N Y .. . .	Died 1892.
284	{ 10 15	Cold from swim'g Scarlet fever.	N. Y .. . . N Y	Sister of Husb No 251.
285	{ 11 11	Sickness Menigitis . .	Hartford . . Horace Mann	Sister of Wife No. 3186.
286	{ — —	Sickness . —	Hartford. . —	Not deaf.
287	{ — B	—	N. Y. . . .	Dead Probably hearing Third marriage, first to Husb No 3036; second to Husb. No 2531, fourth to Husb. No. 4369; fifth to Husb No. 4368
288	{ 17 ..	Brain fever ..	Mich . . .	
289	{ 3 —	Catarrhal fever . —	Pa —	Not deaf
290	{ 1 —	Inflam. fever —	N. Y —	Died 1878 Not deaf
291	{ . B	..... .....	Ind. . . . . Kans. ....	
	{ 3½ B B	Scarlet fever., ..... .....	N. E. Industrial and Montreal ..... Hartford . Hartford	
	{ B B	..... .....	Pa . . . . . Ohio . . . .	Parents second cousins Sister of Husb. No. 2478.
	{ B B	..... .....	Ill . . . . . Ill.....	Parents cousins. Died 1892
	{ B 3	..... Scarlet fever.....	Pa . . . . . Pa.....	
		.....	Ind.....	
		Brain fever.....	Ind.....	Mother of Wife No 2682
	{ 3 1½	Chills and fever . Chills, .....	Va..... Va.....	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives. (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown.			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown.	
1300	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1861 1861	1 1	1 1			2 cousins .....
1301	1892						{ Husband Wife	1850 1837	6 5	1 1	5 4	—	.....
1302	1892		3	3			{ Husband Wife		1 1	1			.....
1303	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1854	3 12	3 1	3 11	—	Mother (Wife No 1302) ..
1304	1892		1		1		{ Husband Wife		8	3	5	—	.....
1305	1890	1873	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1843	3 6	2 2	1 4	—	.....
1306	1890	1889					{ Husband Wife	1840 1860	3 3	2 1	1 2	—	.....
1307	1893	1891	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1862 1862	1 7	1 3			.....
1308	1890	1866	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1822 1834	6 9	2 1	4 8	—	.....
1309	1891						{ Husband Wife	1865	3	2	1		.....
1310	1891	1840	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1815 1816	6 9	2 7	4 2	—	.....
1311	1889		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			.....
1312	1890						{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			.....
1313	1890						{ Husband Wife	1807	3	1	2	—	.....
1314	1890	1893	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1774	1	1			.....
1315	1891						{ Husband Wife		1 1	1 1			.....
1316	1890	sev	—	all	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1862	1	1			.....
1317	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1872	3 1	1 1	2	—	.....
1318	1891	1856	2		2		{ Husband Wife	1828 1820	1 1	1 1			.....
1319	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1839 1847	4 3	1 2	3 1	—	.....
1320	1890	1853	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1828 1824	8 6	1 4	7 2	—	.....
1321	1892	1889	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1867 1867	1 1	1 1			.....
1322	1890	..					{ Husband Wife		9	3	6	—	.....
1323	1890	..	3	..	3		{ Husband Wife	1859	1	1			2 cousins .....
1324	1892	1868	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1835	8	3			Cousins .....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
300 {	2		Neb ... Ia .	
301 {	B 2	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Third marriage, 1st to Husb No. 2650, 2d to Husb. No. 466 Died 1893
302 {	—	—	—	Not deaf Mother of Husb No 1303 and Wife No 3304.
303 {	2	Brain fever	Mo . . Ill	Brother of Wife No 3304 Second marriage, first to Husb No 137
304 {	—	Gradual loss	—	Not deaf
305 {	3 1 1/2	Brain fever Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 1306 Separated.
306 {	3 4	Brain fever Measles	Hartford Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1305. Parents cousins
307 {	B B	. . . .	Mo Mo	Sister of Husb. No 608
308 {	B	Whooping cough	Hartford Pa	Brother of Husb No 1310
309 {	B —	. —	N Y —	Brother of Wife No 3545 Not deaf
10 {	B	"A sea voyage "	Hartford Hartford	Brother of Husb No 1308 Died 1890 Sister of Wife No 1346, Wife No 1358, Husb. No. 2824, Husb No 2825
11 {	. .. ...	. .. ...	Tenn Tenn	
12 {	1 1/2	Fits	Mich	
113 {	1	Scarlet fever	Hartford	Not deaf
114 {	2	Canker rash	Hartford	Died 1861 Not deaf. Died 1869.
315 {	2	F'r. & ris'g in ears Scarlet fever	Ky Ind .	
316 {	1 1/2 —	Sickness —	Ga . —	Not deaf.
317 {	B .	. . . . .	Ark . . . Ky (?) .	
8 {	5	A cold Scarlet fever	N Y N. Y. .	
9 {	3 B	Spotted fever .	Hartford. . . . Hartford . . . .	
11 {	5 B	Scarlet fever .	Hartford . . . Hartford	Sister of Husb No 358
11 {	27 1 1/2	Cong'n of brain? Inflam. of brain	Kans (?). Kans ..	
12 {	B .	. . . . .	N C. . . . .	Brother of Wife No 1847
13 {	— B	. . . . . .	— W. Va. . . . .	Not deaf Parents second cousins
14 {	— B	. . . . . .	— Hartford . . . .	Not deaf Parents cousins. Second marriage; first to Husb. No. 3714 Sister of Husb. No 2764 and Wife No 2738
25 {	3 1/2	Scarlet fever. ...	Hartford . . . .	

### MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No. of Children.				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children ]	
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		
1326	1890						{ Husband Wife	1829	4	1	3	—	
1327	1890	1880	2	2	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1829 1840	4 1	1 1	3 —	—	
1328	1890	1867	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1829 1840	4 1	1 1	3 —	—	
1329	1890	1864	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife.	1844	1	1			
1330	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1862	2 1	2 1			Cousin Cousin
1331	1892	1891					{ Husband Wife	1863	2	2			
1332	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife.	1859 1869	2 4	2 4			
1333	1890						{ Husband Wife	1826	1	1			
1334	1894	1892	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1865 1866	2 3	1 1	1 2	—	
1335	1890						{ Husband Wife	1861	7	1	6	—	
1336	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1861	7	1	6	—	
1337	1893		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1826 1810	1 5	1 5			Cousin.
1338	1890	1846	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1821 1822	4 7	3 3	1 4	—	3 second cousins.
1339	1890	1851	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1821 1823	4 7	3 1	1 6	—	3 second cousins.
1340	1890	1856	6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1821 1833	4 8	3 3	1 5	—	3 second cousins Cousin
1341	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1861 1864	1 1	1 1			2 uncles (Husb No. 1342 is one); su (Wife No 249) Cousin
1342	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1824	11	3	8	—	Nephew (Husb No. 1341)
1343	1893	1861	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1834 1838	1 4	1 1			
1344	1891						{ Husband Wife	1868	1	1			
1345	1893		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife ..	1806 ..	1 2	1 2			
1346	1893	1861	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife.	1806 1814	1 9	1 7			
1347	1894	1892	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1873 1872	11 2	3 1	8 1	—	Cousin
1348	1891						{ Husband Wife ..	..	1	1			
1349	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife ..	....	1	1			

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
1326 {		.....	Mich	
1327 {	2	Scarlet fever.	Hartford ..	First marriage, second to Wife No 1328
		..	Edinburgh	Died 1865
1328 {	2	Scarlet fever	Hartford	Second marriage; first to Wife No 1327
	Inf	Scrofula	Hartford	
1329 {	2	Scarlet fever	Ind., Ky & La	Not deaf Deserted his wife 1869
1330 {		Scarlet fever	Neb	
		Scarlet fever	Neb	
1331 {	B	.	Mo	Brother of Husb No 1332
		.....	Mo	
1332 {	1½	Brain fever	Mo	Brother of Husb No 1331
	B	..	Mo	Sister of Husb No 2637
1333 {	5	Sickness	Ill	Dead.
	B		Ill	
1334 {	3½	Sickness	N Y	
	4½	Cerebro-sp men	N Y	
1335 {	5½	Brain fever	Minn	First marriage, second to Wife No 1336.
				Not deaf
1336 {	5½	Brain fever	Minn	Second marriage; first to Wife No 1335
				Not deaf
1337 {	B	Measles	Ohio	
		..	Ohio	Died 1842 Parents cousins
1338 {	B		Hartford	Brother of Wife No. 3618 and Wife No 3880 First marriage,
	B		Hartford	second to Wife No 1339, third to Wife No 1340
	B		Hartford	Sister of Husband No 1374 Died 1849
1339 {	B		Hartford	Second marriage; first to Wife No 1338, third to Wife No
	4	Inflam of brain	Hartford	1340 Brother of Wife No 3618 and Wife No. 3880
				Died 1854
1340 {	B		Hartford.	Third marriage, first to Wife No 1338; second to Wife No
	B		Hartford.	1339. Brother of Wife No. 3618 and Wife No 3880.
1341 {	2		Neb	
	1½	Scarlet fever	Neb	
1342 {			London.	Parents first cousins Brother of Wife No 249
1343 {	5	Erysipelas	Ohio	
	4	Scarlet fever	Ohio	Died 1857
1344 {	8	Typhoid fever	Ind.	
		...	.....	
1345 {	4+	A cold	N. Y	First marriage, second to Wife No 1346 Died 1893.
	B		N. Y.	Sister of Wife No 260
1346 {	4+	A cold	N Y	Second marriage; first to Wife No 1345. Separated. Died
	B		Hartford	1893.
	B		Hartford	Sister of Wife No. 1358, Wife No. 1310, Husb No 2824, Husb.
	B		N C	No 2825
	B		N C.	Brother of Wife No 2090.
1347 {				
1348 {				Not deaf
			Ky. & Mo..	Third marriage
1349 {				Uneducated.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES.										PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.									
Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage	No. of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters, [Including Person recorded]	Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]				Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown													
1350	1893	1860	sev	—	all	—	{ Husband	1833	1	1									
							{ Wife	1839	1	1									
1351	1890						{ Husband	1862	1	1									
							{ Wife												
1352	1892						{ Husband	1823	1	1									
							{ Wife	181-	6	2	4	—							
1353	1890	1878	3	—	3	—	{ Husband	1854	6	2	4	—							
							{ Wife	1853	5	2	3	—							
1354	1893	1891					{ Husband	1854	6	2	4	—							
							{ Wife	1871	1	1									
1355	1894	1886	2			2	{ Husband	1858	1	1									
							{ Wife	1858	4	1	3	—							
1356	1892						{ Husband	1845	1	1									
							{ Wife	1847	1	1									
1357	1891						{ Husband	1860	1	1									
							{ Wife												
1358	1890	1833	5	—	5	—	{ Husband	1806	9	7	2	—							
							{ Wife												
1359	1893		3	—	3	—	{ Husband	1848	1	1									
							{ Wife	1851	1	1									
1360	1890	1867	1	1	—	—	{ Husband	1843	1	1									
							{ Wife												
1361	1890	1883	2	—	2	—	{ Husband	1861	2	1	1	—							
							{ Wife	1861	7	1	6	—							
1362	1889	1881	4	—	4	—	{ Husband	1849	1	1									
							{ Wife	1855	1	1									
1363	1893	1892					{ Husband	1861	9	2	7	—							
							{ Wife	1866	14	4	10	—							
1364	1891	1885					{ Husband	1853	1	1									
							{ Wife	1853	1	1									
1365	1894	1891	2	—	1	1	{ Husband	1865	8	4	4	—							
							{ Wife	1868	5	2	3	—							
1366	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband	1868	4	3	1	—							
							{ Wife												
1367	1890	1884	—	—	—	—	{ Husband	1855	2	1	1	—							
							{ Wife	1853	2	1	1	—							
1368	1892		1			1	{ Husband	1860	1	1									
							{ Wife	1860	1	1									
1369	1892	1891	1	—	1	—	{ Husband	1860	12	1	11	—							
							{ Wife	1869	15	1	14	—							
1370	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband	1866	6	1	5	—							
							{ Wife	1869	9	2	7	—							
1371	1890	1886	—	—	—	—	{ Husband	1853	5	4	1	—							
							{ Wife	1837	9	1	8	—							
1372	1890						{ Husband	1809	5	2	3	—							
							{ Wife	1804	5	1	4	—							
1373	1890	1874	2	—	2	—	{ Husband	1841	4	1	3	—							
							{ Wife	1850	12	3	9	—							
							{ Husband	1816	7	3	4	—							

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
1350 {	B	Brain fever	Ill	Dead
	6		Ill	
1351 {	2	Brain fever	Kendall & Col	
1352 {	B		Hartford Pa	Died 1864
1353 {	3		Ill & Ind	First marriage, second to Wife No 1354 Brother of Wife No 3044
	3	Gather'g in head	Ill	Parents cousins Died 1887
1354 {	3		Ill & Ind	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1353 Brother of Wife No 3044 Left his wife 1893
	2	Scarlet fever	Ind	
1355 {	B		Germany N Y	Died 1893
1356 {	1½	Inflammation Fever	Ind.	Died 1869
	3		Ind	
1357 {	—	Spinal fever	Ill	Not deaf
1358 {	—	—	—	Not deaf
	B	—	Hartford	Sister of Husb No 2824, Husb No 2825, Wife No 1310, Wife No 1346 Died 1866
1359 {	8	Scarlet fever	Ill	First marriage, second to Husb No 3627
	3	Typhoid fever	Ill	
1360 {	B	—	Ind	Not deaf.
	—	—	—	
1361 {	B	—	Hartford	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 1476
	—	—	—	
1362 {	2	Abscess in head	Wis	
	2	Scarlet fever	Ind	
1363 {	B		Hamilton & Le	Sister of Wife No 1440
	B		Conteulx Le Conteulx & W N Y	
1364 {	B		N Y ..	Brother of Wife No 3808
	B		England	
1365 {	1½	Whooping cough	Ohio Ohio	
1366 {	B		N J & Pa	
1367 {	Inf	Fall	Hart'd & Coll	
	1½	Disease in head	N. Y	
1368 {	5	Epilepsy. . .	Germany (?) Ky	First marriage, second to Husb No 54 Died 1892.
1369 {	14	Spinal fever	Wurtemberg	
	5	Brain fever	Mich	
1370 {	1½	Rising in head	Texas .	Parents cousins Sister of Wife No 3751
	B	..	Texas	
1371 {	B	..	Va ..	
	B	..	Va ..	
1372 {	B	Illness, .....	Hartford ..	
	5		Hartford	
1373 {	B	..	Hartford	Parents third cousins
	B	..	Ind & Tenn	Parents cousin* Sister of Wife No. 178 and Wife No. 178.
1374 {	B	..	Hartford	Brother of Wife No, 1338. Died 1867.
	1½	Ulcers in head ..	Hartford	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children.				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives. (Not including brothers and sisters nor children.)	
			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		Total.	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		
1375	1891						{ Husband Wife	1	1			.....	
1376	1890	3	—	3	—		{ Husband Wife	14 8	7 2	7 6	—	6 nephews and nieces (including Wife No 229, Husb No 4266). Cousin and others	
1377	1890	—	—	—	—		{ Husband Wife	14 2	7 2	7 2	—	6 nephews and nieces (including Wife No 229, Husb No 4266). 6 nephews and nieces (including Wife No 229, Husb No 4266)	
1378	1890	—	—	—	—		{ Husband Wife	14 1	7 1	7 1	—	6 nephews and nieces (including Wife No 229, Husb No 4266). .....	
1379	1890	—	—	—	—		{ Husband Wife	14	7	7	—	6 nephews and nieces (including Wife No 229, Husb. No 4266) .....	
1380	1890	1885	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1859 1857	13 7	3 1	10 6	—	Great-aunt
1381	1892	1863	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	407 397	4 3	1 1	3 2	—	.....
1382	1894	1870					{ Husband Wife	1843	1	1			.....
1383	1894	1874					{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1				.....
1384	1894	1885					{ Husband Wife	1865	3 3	3 1	2	—	.....
1385	1894	1			1		{ Husband Wife	7	1	6	—	.....	
1386	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1863	1 1	1 1			.....
1387	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1856 1863	3 6	1 1	2 5	—	.....
1388	1893	1893	6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1				.....
1389	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1861 1872	1 6	1 2	4	—	.....
1390	1894						{ Husband Wife	1854 1865	4 67	1 17	3 4	—	.....
1391	1895	1874					{ Husband Wife	1	1				.....
1392	1890						{ Husband Wife	2	2				.....
1393	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1863 1868	7 1	2 1	5 —	—	.....
1394	1891	1864	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1832 1842	7 9	1 4	6 5	—	.....
1395	1889	sev	2	sev.	—	—	{ Husband Wife ...	3	3				7 nephews and nieces (Husb. No 397 Husb No 3378, Wife No 4393, Wife No 2465, Wife No 156, Wife No 3116) 5 grand-nephews and nieces (includ- ing Husb No 3687).
1396	1889	1	—	1	—	—	{ Husband Wife ...	1827 1826	6 10	2 3	4 7	—	5 cousins of father. 1 niece; 1 nephew
1397	1891	1888	2	.....	2		{ Husband Wife ...	1864	3	1	2	—	.....
							{ Husband Wife ...	1895	11	1	10	—	.....

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

249

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
375	{ 4	Sickness	Canajoharie	
376	{ B		N Y	Brother of Wife No 4264, Husb No. 1377, Husb No 1379 Dead
	{ B		Canajoharie	Sister of Husb No 1452
377	{ B			First marriage, second to Wife No 1378 Bro of Husb No. 1376, Husb No 1379, Wife No 4264 Dead.
	{ B			Sister of Husb No. 4264
378	{ B			Second marriage; first to Wife No 1377 Brother of Husb. No 1376, Husb No 1379, Wife No 4264 Dead
379	{ B			Brother of Husb No 1376, Husb No 1377, Wife No 4264. Dead.
380	{ B		Va.	Brother of Wife No 3480 and Wife No 2252
	{ 1	Measles & Diph	Va	
381	{ 4	Scarlet fever	Pa	
	{ 4	Scarlet fever	Pa	
382	{ 3	Scarlet fever	Va	Not deaf
	{ —			
383	{		Germany (?)	
	{		Germany (?)	
384	{ B		N Y	
	{ 2	Measles	N. Y	
385	{ B	Scarlet fever	Pa	
386	{ 4	Scarlet fever	Mich	
	{		Mich	
387	{ 7	Nervous fever	Mich	
	{ Inf	Fits	Mich & Le Couteux	
388	{ —		La	Not deaf
	{			
389	{ 1	Fever	Va	
	{ B		Va. & W. Va.	Sister of Wife No 469
390	{ 1	Scarlet fever.	Hartford	
	{ 1½	Illness	Hartford.	
391	{ —			Uneducated
	{ —			Not deaf.
392	{ B			
	{			
393	{ B		Ohio	
	{ 1	Diphtheria	Ohio & Cin	
394	{ 3	Measles	N Y.	Died 1891
	{ B		N Y.	Sister of Wife No 1094.
395	{ —			Not deaf
	{			Sister of Husb No 3377 and Husb No 3380.
396	{ Chl.			
	{ 1	Whooping cough.	N. Y	Dead
397	{ 6	Meningitis	MdA.	Sister of Wife No. 629. First marriage; second to Husb. No 628
	{ —			Not deaf.
398	{ B		Le Couteux	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1399	1890	1874	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1849	3	1	2	—	
1400	1889	1850	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1822 Wife 1826	8	1	7	—	Cousin
1401	1889	1878	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1850	7	2	5	—	Cousin, nephew
1402	1889	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1846	7	1	6	—	1 nephew or niece
1403	1889	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1878 Wife 1856	4	1	3	—	....
1404	1880	1882	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1853	5	1	4	—	=====
1405	1892	1877	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1856 Wife 1859	5	1	4	—	=====
1406	1889	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1857	7	1	6	—	=====
1407	1889	1870	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1847	6	1	5	—	=====
1408	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1866 Wife 1866	3	1	2	—	=====
1409	1889	1882	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1856	10	1	9	—	=====
1410	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1865	2	1	1	—	=====
1411	1890	1886	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1866	7	4	3	—	=====
1412	1889	1880	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 5	7	1	6	—	=====
1413	1889	1871	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 12	4	2	2	—	2 cousins
1414	1889	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1858	7	2	5	—	2 cousins (Husb No 1413 and Husb No. 1415)
1415	1890	1876	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1838 Wife 1856	4	2	2	—	2 cousins (Husb No. 1414 is one)... Uncle
1416	1889	1866	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1842	7	1	6	—	2 second cousins
1417	1893	1876	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1850	4	1	3	—	=====
1418	1889	1888	3	—	1	2	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1868	10	1	9	—	=====
1419	1892	1885	4	—	2	2	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1862	6	1	5	—	=====
1420	1894	1876	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1845	7	1	6	—	=====
1421	1890	1881	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1857 Wife 1856	1	1	—	—	=====
1422	1890	1884	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1864	6	2	4	—	=====
1423	1890	1882	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1865	3	1	2	—	=====

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
399 {	7	Scarlet fever	Pa	
	3	Typhoid fever	Pa	
400 {	Inf	Fits	N Y	
	B		N Y	Sister of Wife No 1596
401 {	9	Typhoid fever	Pa	
	5½	Scarlet fever	Iowa & Pa	Brother of Wife No 226
402 {	B		N Y	
	2	Scarlet fever	N Y	
403 {	B		N Y Imp'd	
	B		Ill	Sister of Husb No 2314
404 {	Inf	Brain fever	Wis	
	B		Wis	Sister of Wife No 944
405 {	5	Cold	Ark	
	2	Stk kness	Ark	
406 {	8	Typhus fever.	N Y, Imp'd	
	B		Clarke	Died 1889
407 {	7	Cold	Wis	
	2	Scarlet fever	Wis	
408 {	6	Brain fever	Mich	
	6	Menigitis	Mich	
409 {	4	Scarlet fever	Pa	
	1	Scarlet fever	Mo	
410 {	B		Ill	
	2	Brain fever	Chicago, Wis, & Norris	
411 {			Ohio	Brother of Wife No 102 and Husb 1436
			Ohio	Died 1890
412 {		Scarlet fever	Ohio	
				Sister of Wife No 2054 and Wife No 2509 Parents second cousins Educated in common schools
413 {	..	...	Ohio	Brother of Husb No 1415
	...	...		Sister of Wife No 1690
414 {	B		Ohio	
	B		Ohio	
415 {	B		Ohio	Bro of Husb No 1413
	B		Ohio	Parents cousins Sister of Husb No 4033, Husb No, 4212, Husb No 4034, and Wife No 3846
416 {	3	Fall ..	Ohio	
			Pa .....	
17 {	B		Ohio	
	..	..	Ohio	Divorced
418 {	5	Fever	Ohio	
	5	Spotted fever	Ohio	
419 {	B		Ohio	
	1	Measles ..	Ohio	
20 {	16	Spotted fever.	Ohio & Coll	
	4	Scarlet fever.	Ohio.	
1 {	7	Spotted fever	Ill	
	13	Brain fever.	Ill.	
2 {	3	Scarlet fever...	Mich	
	3	Chicken pox.	Ill	Brother of Husb. No. 1423
23 {	11½	Menigitis.....	Kans.	
	B		Kans.	

... .. G. ... .. one month after marriage

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE								Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]					
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown		
1425	1890	1882	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1878 Wife 1858	3 4	1 —	2 4	—	—	
1426	1889	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife 1862	7 6	1 1	6 5	—	—	
1427	1890	1849	8	—	8	—	{ Husband 1818 Wife 1827	9 6	1 1	8 5	—	—	
1428	1889	1863	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1829	5 12	1 —	4 12	—	—	
1429	1889	1859	8	—	8	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1838	6 7	2 1	4 6	—	Cousin	
1430	1889	1868	4	1	3	—	{ Husband Wife 1843	8 8	1 1	7 7	—	—	
1431	1890	1871	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1843	5 5	2 —	3 5	—	Fourth cousin (Husb No. 144); grand- father partially deaf.	
1432	1889	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1867	10 11	1 2	9 9	—	2 cousins	
1433	1889	1873	7	—	7	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1849	4 4	2 1	2 3	—	2 third cousins (Wife No. 1253 and Husb No. 2476) 2 nieces	
1434	1889		2	1	1	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1853	3 8	1 5	2 3	—	.....	
1435	1889	1884	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1861	1 4	1 1	— 3	—	.....	
1436	1890	1884	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1860	7	4	3	—	.....	
1437	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1861	9 5	1 4	8 1	—	—	
1438	1890	1887	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1861	8 3	3 1	5 2	—	Cousin	
1439	1889	1886	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1866	8 6	3 1	5 —	5	Cousin	
1440	1889	1877	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1856	5 14	1 4	4 10	—	.....	
1441	1889	1878	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1852	10 3	1 1	9 2	—	Cousin	
1442	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1869	5 5	2 1	3 4	—	2 cousins	
1443	1889	1863	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1834 Wife 1843	1 6	1 1	— 5	—	3 cousins (including Husb No. 4159)	
1444	1890	1878	2	—	—	2	{ Husband 1849 Wife 1850	8 5	1 2	7 3	—	—	
1445	1890	1878	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1845 Wife 1853	4 6	1 1	3 5	—	—	
1446	1890	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1866	12 1	1 1	11 —	—	—	
1447	1890	1876	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1838	2 2	2 2	— .	—	Nephew	
1448	1890	1861	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1828 Wife 1828	4 —	1 —	3 —	—	.....	
							{ Husband 1828	1	1	—	—	.....	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
1425 {	13	Meningitis ..	Ill & Coll	Not deaf
1426 {	5	Scarlet fever	Angerburg	
	4	Brain fever	Lutheran	
1427 {	4	Scarlet fever	Pa ...	Died 1883.
			Ohio.	
1428 {	3	Brain fever ..	Edgbaston.	Not deaf
29 {	B	...	Ohio	Brother of Wife No 3008.
	B	...	Ohio	
30 {	4	Typhoid fever.	..	
31 {	B	....	Har'd & Coll	Brother of Wife No 268 Died 1890
	—	—	—	Not deaf Parents cousins
32 {	B	...	Ohio	
	7	Spotted fever ...	Ohio.	Sister of Wife No 3099
33 {	2	Rising in head ..	Ky	Brother of Wife No 281 Parents cousins.
		...	Ky	
34 {	1	Gather'g in head	Pa . ...	Parents second cousins Sister of Husb No 1667
	B	...	Pa	
35 {	B	Hydrocephalus	Pa	
	3 1/2		Pa	
36 {	—	....	Ohio	Bro of Husb. No 1411 and Wife No 102 Died 1895
			—	Not deaf
37 {	1	Scarlet fever	Ont.	
	B	...	Kans	Sister of Wife No 2420 and Wife No 3138
38 {	1 1/2	Measles ...	Pa	Parents third cousins Brother of Husband No 1430
	8	Scarlet fever .	Minn	Died 1889
39 {	1 1/2	Diphtheria ...	Minn	Parents third cousins Brother of Husb No 1438.
	7	Meningitis .	Minn	
40 {	3	Cold ..	N Y & W N Y	Died 1888
	2	Fall on head	Le Conteulx .	First marriage; second to Husb No 3495 Sister of Wife No 1863
41 {	3	Measles	Ky	
	7 1/2	Scarlet fever.	Ky	Parents fourth cousins
42 {	B	...	Minn.	Parents second cousins
	5	Meningitis.....	Minn.	
43 {	B	...	Pa.	Probably dead.
	1 1/2	Inflam of brain.	Ohio ...	First marriage; second to Husb No 2473; third to Husb. No, 1692
44 {	7	Ague or calomel.	Mich. .	
	B	.....	Mich. .	Sister of Husb. No. 254.
45 {	B	...	Christiania	
	3	Scarlet fever.	Wia. .	
46 {	1	...	Mich	
	B	...	Mich	
47 {	B	...	Ohio	
		...	Ohio	Second marriage; first to Husb. No. 3444. Sister of Husb. No 1461.
48 {	3 1/2	Scarlet fever. ...	Hartford ...	
	—	—	—	Not deaf.
49 {		Inflam. of brain.	Ohio.....	
		Measles.....	Ohio.....	Dead.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown	
1450	1890	1880	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1862	2 7	1 1	1 6	—	—
1451	1890	1885	3	1	1	1	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1864	2 3	2 1	— 2	—	—
1452	1890	1865	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1835 Wife 1834	8 8	2 3	6 5	—	Cousin and others
1453	1890	1874	3	1	2	—	{ Husband 1844 Wife 1847	10 4	1 3	9 1	—	Father (Husb No 3193), uncle, aunt, 7 second cousins (including Husb No 1826, Husb No 1687, Husb No 1825), 2 third cousins (Wife No 21 and Husb No 1676), 1 fourth cousin, great-aunt, great-uncle (Husb No 1824), nephew
1454	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1871	1 3	1 3	—	—	.. ..
1455	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1860	1 1	1 1	—	—	.. ..
1456	1890	1845	7	—	7	—	{ Husband Wife 1825	8 4	— 1	8 3	—	Mother (Wife No 1457), aunt, 2d cousin
1457	1890	1821	8	—	8	—	{ Husband 1787 Wife 1798	6	2	4	—	Cousin
1458	1894	1892	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1858	3 1	1 1	2	—	—
1459	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1837	1 1	1 1	—	—	.. ..
1460	1894	1893	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1867 Wife 1872	3 10	1 1	2 9	—	—
1461	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife	1	1	—	—	.. ..
1462	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1860 Wife	1	1	—	—	.. ..
1463	1893	1892	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1857	3 3	1 1	2 2	—	.. ..
1464	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1847 Wife 1859	1 9	1 2	— 7	—	—
1465	1893	1891	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1854 Wife	7 1	1 1	6	—	Cousin (Husb No 3111) .. ..
1466	1894	1891	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1871	8 9	1 2	7 7	—	.. ..
1467	1890	1868	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1862 Wife 1866	1 1	1 1	—	—	.. ..
1468	1893	1892					{ Husband 1864 Wife 1868	1 7	1 2	— 5	—	3 paternal cousins; 1 maternal second cousin; third cousin; 4 distant cou- sins
1469	1890						{ Husband .. Wife	1 1	1 1	—	—	.. ..
1470	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1868 Wife	5	1	4	—	.. ..
1471	1893		1	1	..	..	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	.. ..
1472	1890	..	..	..	..	..	{ Husband 1862 Wife ..	1	1	—	—	.. ..

# Tabular Statement of Marriages.

255

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Refer. No. number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
450 {	11 3	Brain & Ty'd fev Inflam of brain	Mich Mich	Died 1889.
451 {	2	Spasms	Ohio Ohio	Brother of Wife No. 1447      Second marriage, first to Wife No 1553
452 {	B 1 1/2	Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Brother of Wife No 1376
453 {	5 B	Scarlet fever	Ind Ky	Sister of Husb No 3201
54 {	B 2	Scarlet fever	Ky Ky	
55 {	5 3	Spotted fever	Ind Ind	
56 {	— B	—	N Y	Not Deaf
57 {	— B	—	Hartford	Not deaf      Died 1851 Died 1877
58 {	1 1/2	B'n fev & dipht'a	Md. ... Va	
59 {	B	Ulcers	Ohio Ind.	
60 {	4 + 3 1/2	Brain fever Brain fever	Pa & Minn Ohio.	
61 {			Miss ..	
62 {	—	—	Ala	Not deaf
63 {	2 3	Cold Water on brain	Hartford Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 1579 Died 1893
64 {	B		Mich Mich	
65 {	1	Gather'g in head	Pa	Educated at home. Semi-mute
66 {	1 1/2 1	Cerebro-sp men Whooping cough	Ohio ... Ohio	
67 {	2 8	Measles and gath- ering in head. Spotted fever	Ill Ill	
68 {	4 B	Typhoid-pneu'a	Ga .. Ga	
69 {	B		Ky Ky	
70 {	5 —	Spinal meningitis	N. J.	Not deaf.
71 {	11 B	Typhoid fever	Ill Kan	Dead. Parents third cousins.
72 {	B —		Mo	Not deaf.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1474	1890	1861	8	—	7	1	{ Husband Wife	1838 1845	5 1	1 1	4 —	—	—
1475	1890	1865					{ Husband Wife	1811 1822	1 8	1 2	— 6	—	.. .. .
1476	1890	1881	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1858	2 7	1 1	1 6	—	.. .. .
1477	1892		1			1	{ Husband Wife	1861 1869	2 6	2 1	— 5	—	.. .. .
1478	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1865 —	1 —	1 —	— —	—	.. .. .
1479	1893						{ Husband Wife	1867 —	6 —	1 —	5 —	—	.. .. .
1480	1890	1868	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1841 —	3 1	1 1	2 —	—	.. .. .
1481	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1852	6 7	1 1	5 6	—	—
1482	1890	sev	—	all	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1847	6 1	1 1	5 —	—	—
1483	1890		3	1	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1810 1827	2 1	2 1	— —	—	.. .. .
1484	1892	1891					{ Husband Wife	1861 —	1 3	1 1	— 2	—	.. .. .
1485	1892	1878	4	1	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1855 1855	2 2	2 2	— —	—	Parents (No. 1487)
1486	1890						{ Husband Wife	1847 1851	8 11	1 3	7 8	—	3d cousin (Husb No 671)
1487	1889	1851	2	2			{ Husband Wife	1826 1828	1 1	1 1	— —	—	.. .. .
1488	1890						{ Husband Wife	1814 —	1 —	1 —	— —	—	.. .. .
1489	1889	1885	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	— 11	1 11	1 3	— 8	—	.. .. .
1490	1890	1866	4	2	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1834 1845	5 9	3 1	2 8	—	2 second cousins (Wife No. 1630 and Wd No 3821)
1491	1890	1866	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1839 1838	2 3	1 1	1 2	—	.. .. .
1492	1893	1884					{ Husband Wife	1856 1841	7 11	2 1	5 10	—	Third cousin
1493	1891	1891	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1856 1860	6 1	2 1	4 —	—	.. .. .
1494	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	— 1868	1 2	1 —	— 2	—	Parents (No. 3841), 2 uncles (Husb. No 3843 and Husb No 3847); aunt (Wd No. 3821)
1495	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1839 1849	1 1	1 1	— —	—	.. .. .
1496	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1839 —	1 1	1 —	— —	—	.. .. .
1497	1892	767	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1842 1849	3 3	1 3	2 —	—	Great-uncle and cousin

8 MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
1474	{ B	.....	Hartford .	Semi-mute Not at school
1475	{ B	.....	Pa	
	{ B	.....	Va . . .	
1476	{ 1½	Cold in head	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Wife No 1361
1477	{	Gather'g in head	Ill . Ill	
1478	{ 13	Gradual decay	N Y & W. N. Y	Not deaf
1479	{ 1	Measles	Ohio. .	
1480	{ B		Hartford	Died 1886
1481	{ 1½	Measles & s't fr.	N Y & Ill	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1482.
	{ 2	Brain fever	Ill	
1482	{ 1½	Measles & s't fr.	N Y. & Ill.	Separated First marriage, second to Wife No 1481.
	{ 6	Measles	Ill.	Second marriage first to Husb No 1718
1483	{ B		N Y & H'd	
	{ 2	Gather'g in head	N. Y	Mother of Husb. No 1576
1484	{ B	Brain fever.	Ohio.	First marriage, second to Wife No. 1590.
	{ B		Ohio	Died 1892.
1485	{ 14	Colds. Gradual decline since 7 years of age.	Ky & Coll	
	{ B		Ill.	Sister of Husb No 1758
1486	{ 4	Illness	Mich .	Died 1887.
	{ B		Mich	Sister of Husb No 692 and Wife No. 3155.
1487	{ 10	Scarlet fever	Ky .	Died 1876.
	{ 5	Scarlet fever.	Ky	Mother of Husb No 1485. Died 1856
88	{ B		Pa.	
	{		...	
89	{ B		...	Semi-mute
	{ B		...	Parents cousins Sister of Husb No 2911.
90	{ B		N. Y. . .	Brother of Wife No. 3442.
	{ 3	Brain fever	N. Y	
91	{ 2	Gather'g in head	Ill & Ind.	
	{	Fever	Ill. . .	
192	{ 2½	Scarlet fever	N Y. . .	
	{ 2½	Scarlet fever.	N Y . . .	Second marriage, first to Husb No. 2558.
193	{ B		Mich. . . .	Brother of Husb. No. 1422.
	{ B		Mich. & N. Y.	
194	{		Mich. & Ohio	Not deaf.
	{			
195	{ 2	Inflam. in head.	Ill. . . . .	First marriage; second to Wife No. 1496.
	{ B		Ill. . . . .	Dead.
96	{ 2	Inflam. in head.	Ill. . . . .	Second marriage; first to Wife No. 1495
	{			Semi-mute.
97	{ 1	Cold.....	Texas.....	
	{ 4	Quinine. . .	Texas . . .	
98	{ 1½	Scarlet fever	Hartford . . . .	Died 1874.



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded.)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children )		
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing	Unknown			
1499	1891	1890	1			1	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1863	3	1	2	—	— . . . . .		
1500	1893	1891	2			2	{ Husband 1860 Wife 1872	5	2	3	—	— . .		
1501	1890						{ Husband Wife 1841	1	1	1	—	— . . . . .		
1502	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1867	1	1	12	3	9	—	— . .
1503	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1858	1	1	3	1	2	—	—
1504	1890						{ Husband 1822 Wife 1823	6	1	1	5	—	—	
1505	1892	1858	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1822 Wife 1840	6	1	8	1	7	—	—
1506	1889		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1	1	1	1	—	—	—
1507	1893	1888	2	—	1	1	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1857	9	1	1	8	—	—	
1508	1894	1892	1			1	{ Husb Wife 1870	1	1	1	—	—	—	
1509	1890						{ Husband 1859 Wife	6	1	6	—	—	—	
1510	1890	1868	2	—	2	—	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1846	2	1	9	1	8	—	Cousins
1511	1892	1890	1			1	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1858	4	1	8	1	7	—	—
1512	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1866	4	1	1	3	—	—	
1513	1894	1891	2			2	{ Husband 1858 Wife 1870	1	1	3	1	2	—	— . .
1514	1890						{ Husband Wife 1859	1	1	1	—	—	—	—
1515	1894		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1846 Wife 1847	4	3	4	2	1	—	— . .
1516	1890		4			4	{ Husband Wife 1851	1	1	1	1	—	—	—
1517	1894		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1815 Wife	8	1	7	—	—	—	—
1518	1890	1866	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 187	8	4	11	4	7	—	3 cousins
1519	1892	1867	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1832 Wife 1836	8	4	2	1	1	—	3 cousins
1520	1890						{ Husband Wife 1855	1	1	1	—	—	—	— . .
1521	1891	1888	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1862	3	—	3	2	1	—	—
1522	1891		1			1	{ Husband 1842 Wife 1856	1	1	1	—	—	—	— . . . . .
1523	1892	1890	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1	1	1	—	—	—	— . . . . .
							{ Husband 1863	10	4	6	—	—	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
499 {	2 B	Measles.	N Y. Imp'd. N Y Imp'd	
500 {	B		C N Y Le Contoulx	
501 {	3	Rising in ears.	Ky Mo	
502 {	B		Mich	Sister of Wife No 4056
503 {	4	Scarlet fever	N Y & C N Y. C N Y & N. Y.	Dead.
504 {	B 4	Spasms	Ind Ind	First marriage, second to Wife No 1505 Dead
1505 {	B 3	Sickness	Ind Ind	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1504
1506 {			Tenn Tenn	
1507 {	4 5	Congestive chill Spotted fever	Ind Ind	
1508 {	B		Clarke & Hor- ace Mann.	
1509 {	1 1/2	Teething	Mich	
1510 {	B 1 1/2	Scarlet fever	Hartford Hartford	Parents second cousins
1511 {	B 2	Scarlet fever	N Y N Y.	Second marriage, first to Husb No 212 Died 1892
1512 {	7 7	Spinal fever. Spinal fever	N Y Imp & Col N Y Impr'd	
1513 {	B 2	Scarlet fever	N Y N. Y	
1514 {	1 1/2	Scarlet fever	N Y Impr'd	Not deaf Parents cousins
1515 {	B 1 1/2	Whooping cough	Hartford Hartford	Parents cousins
1516 {		Typhoid fever & quinine	Mich Mich	Died 1891.
1517 {	1	Spotted fever	Hartford	Died 1894. Not deaf
1518 {	B B		Ind & Ill. La	Parents second cousins Brother of Husb. No 1519
1519 {	B 4	Scarlet fever.	Ind. Ind	Parents second cousins. Brother of Husb No. 1518
1520 {	2	Fever	Ga.	
1521 {	B		N C	Not deaf Sister of Wife No 2009
1522 {	3 1/2	Cold and abscess Sickness	Ill Ill	Died 1891.
1523 {				
1524 {	1 1/2	Intermitt fever	Ill	Not deaf. Brother of Wife No. 643 and Wife No. 1636.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children.					Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children.)
			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown			Total.	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown	
1525	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1863 1863	1 2	1 1	— 1	—	
1526	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1814 1813	1 1	1 1	— —	—	..
1527	1890		5	1	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1814 1813	3 9	1 3	2 6	—	
1528	1890	sev	—	—	all	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1858	6 6	1 1	5 5	—	
1529	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1858	6 5	1 2	5 3	—	
1530	1891		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1840	4 1	4 1	— —	—	
1531	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1827 1827	1 10	1 3	— 7	—	Niece (Wife No 3612), mother gradually became deaf, also aunt late in life
1532	1890	1889	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1868	8 1	1 1	7 —	—	
1533	1890		6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1833 1833	3 3	1 1	2 —	—	Niece
1534	1891	1864					{ Husband Wife	1821 1836	1 3	1 3	— —	—	
1535	1890						{ Husband Wife	1837 1837	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1536	1892		1		1		{ Husband Wife	1834 1834	2 1	2 1	— —	—	
1537	1889						{ Husband Wife	1834 1834	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1538	1891	1865	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1824 1839	8 5	1 1	7 4	—	Distant cousin
1539	1890						{ Husband Wife	1819 1819	8 8	1 1	7 —	—	
1540	1893	1850	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1807 1821	6 7	1 3	5 4	—	
1541	1894	1889	2			2	{ Husband Wife	1867 1867	1 3	1 1	— 2	—	
1542	1890						{ Husband Wife	1849 1849	4 1	1 1	3 —	—	
1543	1890	sev.	—	—	all	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1868	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1544	1890	1868	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1836 1844	6 7	1 2	5 5	—	Uncle. Cousin
1545	1890						{ Husband Wife	1859 1859	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1546	1890		1	1	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1837 1844	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1547	1890						{ Husband Wife	1837 1848	1 1	1 1	— —	—	
1548	1890	1865	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1827 1827	7 7	2 2	5 —	—	
1549	1893	807	2			2	{ Husband Wife	1859 1863	1 1	1 1	— —	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
525	1½	Bilious fever . .	C. N Y	
526			Ont Ont	Died 1891
527	6	Illness Spotted fever	Hartford Hartford	Died 1889 Sister of Husb No. 795
528	B		Ill . .	Probably first marriage, second to Wife No 1529 Not deaf
529	B	...	Ill Neb	Probably second marriage, first to Wife No 1528.
530	B		Germany Ohio	Brother of Wife No 1029 Second marriage, 1st to Husb No 8929
531	B		Ireland Hartford	First marriage, second to Husb No 2454. Sister of Husb. No 262, Wife No 2819, Wife No 770
532	2½ 6	Scarlet fever Spinal meningitis	Cal Neb & Cal	
533	2	Fits	Va.	Not deaf Divorced Second marriage, first to Husb No. 53
534	B?		Ireland N Y	Died 1891
535	3	Fever	Ind	
536			N Y.	
537				
538	2 B	Calomel .....	Hartford Hartford	Died 1891 Parents cousins
539	2½	Fever	Hartford	Not deaf.
540	½ B	Disease in head	Hartford Hartford ...	Died 1884. Died 1893.
541			Va .	Lost his hearing at 2 from scarlet fever; regained it during attack of erysipelas at age of 12.
542	5	Cerebro-sp men	N Y .	
543	2	Rising in head .....	N O N O	
543	3½ 3	Spinal meningitis Brain fever .	Ill Ill ..	Parents cousins.
544	B 2	..... Scarlet fever . .	Hartford Hartford . .	Dead.
545	B	.....	Mich ..	
546	8	Winter fever .....	Ill. Ill ..	First or second marriage; other wife No 1547
547	8	Winter fever Measles.	Ill . . . Ill.....	Second or first marriage; other wife No 1546
548	1½	Illness.....	Hartford ..	Not deaf.
549	1 1	Gather'g in head. Lung fever.....	Is. . . . Is. ....	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number.	MARRIAGES					PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.									
	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children ]			
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown				
1551	1890	1880	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1858	9 10	— 1	9 9	— —			
1552	1892	1874	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1840	1 1	1 1			..		
1553	1889	1863	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1840	2 6	2 1	2 5	— —			
1554	1890	1866	47	3	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1840 1837	1 1	1 1			..		
1555	1892	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1887	2	2			...		
1556	1890	1848	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1818	10	5	5	—	3 grand-nephews and 2 grand-nieces		
1557	1890	1890	11	—	11	—	{ Husband Wife	1805	10	5	5	—	...		
1558	1890	1851	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1805	10	5	5	—			
1559	1890	1884	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1857	3 3	1 1	2 2	— —			
1560	1890	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1861	1 1	1 1					
1561	1890	—	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1825	3	1	2	—	..		
1562	1891	1889	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1863 1863	1 1	1 1			..		
1563	1891	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1829	1 1	1 1			..		
1564	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1865 1864	1 1	1 1			..		
1565	1892	1	—	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1867 1866	1 1	1 1					
1566	1890	1855	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1832 1832	10 10	1 4	9 2	— 4			
1567	1889	3	—	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1854	5	1	4	—	..		
1568	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1864 1860	7 1	1 1	6	—			
1569	1890	—	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1859	2	1	1	—			
1570	1892	1892	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1864 1869	1 8	1 2	6	—	..		
1571	1890	1868	7	—	7	—	{ Husband Wife	1839 1848	1 1	1 1					
1572	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1864	1 1	1 1			..		
1573	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1872	1 3	1 3			..		
1574	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1817	1	1			..		

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks.
551	{ 5	Scarlet fever	Ky	Not deaf
552	{ 8 1 1/2	Brain fever . Inflam of brain	Prussia Ind	
553	{ 4	Brain fever	Ohio Ohio	First marriage, 2d to Wife No 1451 Bro of Wife No 1447. Died 1884
554	{ B B?	. .	N Y N. Y	
555	{ B —	—	Ky	Not deaf
556	{ — —	—	Ky	Brother of Husb No 1577 and Wife No 1813. Died 1871 Not deaf
557	{ B 5+	Rising in head	Ky	First marriage, second to Wife No 1558 Brother of Husb. No 1556 and Wife No 1813 Died 1878 Five grandchildren were deaf
558	{ B —	—	Ky	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1557 Brother of Wife No 1813 and Husb No 1556 Died 1878. Not deaf
559	{ 2 B	Measles	Fla., Whipple's and College Va & Tenn	Dead
560	{		Ill	Died 1889
561	{ — 7	Disease in head	Hartford	Not deaf. Divorced First marriage
562	{ 3 2		Wis Wis	
563	{ ..		N Y	
564	{ 8 3	Spinal meningitis Spotted fever	Mo & Coll. Mo	
565	{ 5 3	Spinal fever Typhoid fever & medicine	Ind Ind	
566	{ Inf Inf.	Cold, gathering in head Measles	N Y N Y ..	Sister of Husb No 1672, Wife No 2231, Wife No. 3583
567	{ — 1 1/2	Croup	Md . . .	Not deaf
568	{ 2+ 1 1/2	Typhoid fever or cramps Inflam of brain	Mich & Norris Mich	
569	{ 16 —	Spotted fever	Mich. & Coll	Dead. Not deaf
70	{ 1 B	Brain fever ....	Mich . Mich .	
71	{ 2 B	Scarlet fever.	Hartford . . Hartford ...	
72	{ 3 —	Scarlet fever .. .....	Ind . . . Ind . . . .	Parents second cousins.
73	{ B —	..... .....	La La <sup>6</sup> ....	
74	{ 9 8 1/2	Scarlet fever. Scarlet fever .	N. Y. & Coll ... N. Y . . .	

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No. of Children.				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown	
1575	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1860	1 1	1 1			.....
1576	1894	1877					{ Husband 1846 Wife 497	3 1	1 1	2	—	Parents (No 1483); aunt .....
1577	1894	1865					{ Husband Wife 1841	1 1	1			..
1578	1892	1867	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1846	1 1	1 1			.....
1579	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1865	3 3	1 1	2 2	—	.....
1580	1894	877					{ Husband Wife	1 1	1			..
1581	1894	1893	1			1	{ Husband 1870 Wife 1871	1 1	1 1			.....
1582	1894	1894	1	—	—	1	{ Husband 1870 Wife 1873	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	.....
1583	1894	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1867	1 3	1 3			.....
1584	1889						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			.....
1585	1893		1			1	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1			.....
1586	1895		5			5	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1			.....
1587	1895	1880					{ Husband 1849 Wife	1 1	1			.....
1588	1895		—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1840	10	4	6	—	.....
1589			1	1			{ Husband Wife					.....
1590	1895	1895	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife	1 1	1 1			.....
1591	1895	1895	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1867	5 5	1 1	4 4	—	.....
1592	1895	1894	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife 1843	6	1	5	—	3 cousins (including Husb. No. 4159)
1593	1893	1887	3	—	1	2	{ Husband 1863 Wife 1871	15 4	3 4	12	—	Parents (No. 4311); uncle (Husb. No 133); 6 aunts (including Wife No 3355, Wife No 2461, Wife No 290 Wife No. 3141, Wife No 133); cousin
1594	1889	1860	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife 1841	1 6	1 1	5	—	.....
1595	1890	1866	sev	—	all	—	{ Husband 1841 Wife 1844	3 13	1 1	2 12	—	2 third cousins .....
1596	1889		sev	1	sev.	—	{ Husband 1825 Wife	2 16	2 4	— 12	—	Cousins .. Cousin.. ..
1597	1889	1876	..	..	...		{ Husband 1846 Wife 1840	4 9	1 1	3 8	—	.....
1598	1890	...	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife.... 1848	1 2	1 1	1	—	3 uncles; 6 cousins (including Husb No. 140, Husb. No. 1949).

# *Tabular Statement of Marriages.*

265

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
1875 {	B	..	Ill	
	B		Ill	
1876 {	2½	Scarlet fever.	N Y	
			N Y	
1877 {	B	.	N Y	
1878 {	4	Scarlet fever	N Y	
			N Y	
1879 {	2	Cold.	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1463
	B		Hartford.	
1880 {	.	—	.	Divorced in 1894
				Not deaf
1881 {	2	Brain fever	St Joseph's &	
			N Y Imp'd	
1881 {	1½	Measles	N Y Imp'd	
1882 {	½	Abscess in ears	Pa	
		Scarlet fever	Ohio.	
1883 {	2	Spotted fever	Ind.	
	5	Spotted fever	Ind	
1884 {		.	England	
1885 {				
1886 {			—	Uneducated
1887 {	14	Fits ..	N Y	
		...		
1888 {	—	—	—	Not deaf
1888 {	4	Scarlet fever	Doncaster .	First marriage, second to Husb No 2229. Sister of Wife No 4032.
1889 {	—	—	.	Not deaf
1890 {	3	Brain fever . .	Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1484
			Ohio	
1891 {	5	Measles	Ohio	
	3	Spotted fever	Ohio	
1892 {	½	.....	Ohio	
	½	Inflam of brain.	Ohio	Third marriage, first to Husb No 1443, second to Husb. No 2473
1893 {	10	Scarlet fever.	Pa	
	B	.....	Md. & Pa	Sister of Wife No 1109 Paternal grandparents were second cousins
1894 {	B	.....	Pa	
	B	.....	Ohio	Died 1874.
1895 {	1½	Fits	Ohio	
	B	.....	Ind. and Ill	
1896 {	B	.....	N. Y	
	B	.....	N Y	Sister of Wife No. 1400
1897 {		.....	Ohio	
		Scarlet fever. ..	Ohio..	Second marriage; first to Husb No. 1186.
1898 {		.....	.	
	B	.....	Hartford	
1899 {	16	Paral. of aud. nerve	Tenn. & Coll...	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No. of Children.					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Per-son recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown			Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown.	
1600	1890	1886	1	1	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1897 1862	5 4	1 1	4 3	—	— —
1601	1889	1863	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1829 1833	6 2	2 2	4 —	—	2 second cousins (Husb No 2462 and Wife No 3109); 3 third cousins nephew (Husb No. 2973)
1602	1889	1879	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife	1853 1854	6 5	1 3	5 2	—	1 niece .....
1603	1890	1880	4	—	3	1	{ Husband Wife	1858 1860	2 5	1 2	1 3	—	Parents (No 1172) .....
1604	1889	1882	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1861	6 6	1 1	5 5	—	— —
1605	1889		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1861	4 9	2 2	2 7	—	— .....
1606	1894	1865	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1832 1840	10 8	1 2	9 6	—	.....
1607	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1832 1844	10 13	1 1	9 12	—	.....
1608	1889	1872	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1837 1845	7 5	4 1	3 4	—	Niece .....
1609	1889	1868	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1835 1849	1 5	1 1	— 4	—	Cousin .....
1610	1889	1879	5	—	5	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1854	4 5	2 2	2 3	—	— —
1611	1889	1882	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife ..	1841 1839	9 9	1 1	8 8	—	— —
1612	1894	1880	4	—	3	1	{ Husband Wife	1846 1860	10 5	1 1	9 4	—	.....
1613	1889	1872	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1823 1827	6 2	1 1	5 1	—	.....
1614	1889	1875	6	—	6	—	{ Husband Wife	1848 1867	13 1	1 1	12 —	—	— —
1615	1894	1886	4	—	3	1	{ Husband Wife	1856 1856	6 6	4 4	2 2	—	.....
1616	1889	1884					{ Husband Wife	1860 1845	7 8	2 2	5 6	—	3 cousins .....
1617	1889	1884	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1849 1843	7 8	2 2	5 6	—	3 cousins .....
1618	1889	1879	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1849 1856	8 5	2 1	6 4	—	— —
1619	1889	1881	3	—	—	3	{ Husband Wife	1849 1855	8 5	2 2	6 3	—	Parents (No. 2195); aunt .....
1620	1889	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife ..	1859 1862	4 5	2 1	2 4	—	Cousin (Wife No. 1260) .....
1621	1889	1886	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1848 1857	4 5	1 1	3 4	—	.....
1622	1889	1887					{ Husband Wife ..	1860 1862	6 2	2 1	— 1	—	Cousin .....
1623	1893	1864	4	—	4	—	{ Husband Wife ..	1838 1841	1 1	1 1	— —	—	.....
1624	1889	1867	1	1	..	.....	{ Husband Wife ..	1842 1845	5 9	2 5	3 4	—	.....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
900 {	5 1	Brain fever Typhoid fever	Cleveland Ohio	
901 {	1½ B		Ind Ohio	Brother of Wife No 3793 Died 1853 Sister of Husb No 2943
902 {	10 B	Spotted fever	Kans Kans	Sister of Wife No 640 and Husb No 2048
903 {	7 2	Fall Scarlet fever	Ill Ill	Sister of Husb No 1177
904 {	3½ 5	Fall into hot water	Wis Wis	
905 {	B B		Ark Ark	Bro of Husb No 1610 Died 1886 or 87
906 {	B B		Ohio Ohio	First marriage second to Wife No 1607 Died 1875
907 {	B 8	Sickness	Ohio Ohio	Second marriage first to Wife 1106
908 {	B 5	Scarlet fever	N Y Ia	Brother of Wife No 941 Husb No 1166 Wife No 4054
909 {	B 3	Scarlet fever	Ohio Iowa	Wife 1st husband because he was a drunkard First marriage second to Husb No 3112
910 {	B B		Ark Ark	Brother of Husb No 1609 Sister of Wife No 4022
911 {	3½ 2	Brain disease Scarlet fever	Pa Va, Balt, & Ia	Second marriage first to Husb No 4017
912 {	3 3	Fever Scarlet fever	Ohio Ohio	
913 {	Inf Fever	Cold Fever	Ohio Ohio	
914 {	7 2½	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Esslingen N Y	
915 {	B 9	Teething and gathering in head	N Y Pa & N Y	Brother of Wife No 3018 Husb No 1783 Husb No 1782 Sister of Husb No 3018 and Husb No 3017
	B		Ohio	Brother of Husb No 1617 Sister of Wife No 1617
	B		Ohio	Brother of Husb No 1616 Sister of Wife No 1616
	2 2	Measles Scarlet fever	Mo & Pa Pa	First marriage 2d to Wife No 1619 3d to Wife No 1669 Died 1880
	2 Inf	Measles Fall	Mo & Pa Pa & Ohio	Second marriage 1st to Wife No 1618 3d to Wife No 1669 Sister of Husb No 2196
	1½ B	Scarlet fever	Md Ohio	
	1½ 7	Fall down stairs Typhoid fever	N Y Pa	Parents cousins
	B 4	Brain fever	Pa Pa	Brother of Wife No 2074
	B B		Pa Pa	
	2 B	Scrofula	Ohio Ohio	Sister of Husb No 3164 and Husb No 3306, mother of Husb No 1920

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children					Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters. [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives. [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total	Deaf.	Hearing.	Unknown.			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown	
1626	1889	1883	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1881 1886	7 5	1 1	6 4	—	Aunt and cousin .. .. .
1627	1889	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1885 1883	10 7	3 2	7 5	—	—
1628	1890	1888	2	—	1	1	{ Husband Wife	1832	7	3	4	—	—
1629	1889	1887	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1854 1897	9 4	1 1	8 3	—	—
1630	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1841 1871	5 5	1 2	4 3	—	Second cousin (Wife No. 1490)
1631	1890	1878	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1841 1847	5 11	1 1	4 10	—	Aunt .. . . .
1632	1889	1880	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1857 1880	3 8	1 1	2 7	—	—
1633	1890	1876	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1837 1834	4 10	1 1	3 9	—	—
1634	1889	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1853 1863	9 7	2 4	7 3	—	—
1635	1893	1887	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1845 1858	8 2	1 —	7 2	—	—
1636	1891	1888	2	—	—	2	{ Husband Wife	1866 1871	8 3	3 1	5 2	—	—
1637	1889	1872	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1854	1	1	—	—	—
1638	1890	1875	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1846 1842	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1639	1889	1882	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1859 1866	6 3	1 1	5 2	—	Mother (Wife No. 1858); 2 second cousins, 2 great-uncles.
1640	1892	1889	1	—	—	1	{ Husband Wife	1859 1866	6 2	1 —	5 2	—	—
1641	1890	1889	.	..	..	..	{ Husband Wife	1866	1	1	..	..	—
1642	1890	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1851 1864	4 10	1 1	3 9	—	—
1643	1890	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1812 1890	9 3	5 1	4 2	—	—
1644	1889	1876	5	—	2	3	{ Husband Wife	1837 1946	5 7	1 1	4 6	—	—
1645	1890	1881	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1860 1860	7 8	1 1	6 7	—	—
1646	1889	1884	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1862 1864	8 3	4 1	4 2	—	—
1647	1894	1887	3	—	1	2	{ Husband Wife	1863 1865	7 9	4 3	3 6	—	—
1648	1890	...	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	...	3	3	—	—	—
1649	1890	....	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1845	1	1	—	—	—
1650	1889	1878	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1840	7 1	2 1	5 ..	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
1626	{ 2 4	Palsy Scarlet fever.	Ohio Pa	Died 1884 Parents second cousins No 2663
1627	{ B B	.	W Pa Pa	First marriage; second to Husb.
1628	{ B —	—	Pa	Parents second cousins Brother of Wife No 4046 and Husb No 1842 Second marriage, 1st to Wife No. 1841. Died 1870 Not deaf
1629	{ 11 14	Spotted fever Meningitis	Ia. & College Iowa	
1630	{ 2½ B	Shock and cold.	Ill & N Y N Y	First marriage; second to Wife No 1631. Sister of Wife No 3921 Died 1871.
1631	{ 2½ 3	Shock and cold Brain fever	Ill & N. Y Ill	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1630
1632	{ 1 6	Sickness Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	
1633	{ B 6	Brain fever	Ill Ohio & Ill	Second marriage, first to Husb No. 2681
1634	{ B B	.	Pa Pa	Brother of Wife No 237 Sister of Husb No 125 and Husb No 220.
1635	{ 11 —	Scarlet fever	Hartf'd & Coll	Not deaf
1636	{ B B	.	Md Md	
1637	{ 2 —	Typhoid fever	Md. & Pa .	Not deaf Died 1874
1638	{ 1 5	Scarlet fever Brain fever	N. Y Pa	
1639	{ B —	—	Mich	First marriage; second to Wife No 1640 Divorced 1889. Not deaf Parents cousins First marriage
1640	{ B —	—	Mich ....	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1639 Not deaf
1641	{ 6 —	Pneumonia	Ohio	Not deaf
1642	{ 1 2½	Measles, Brain fever	Wis Wis .	
1643	{ B B	.	Hartford Hartford	Brother of Wife No 2678.
1644	{ 1 2	Measles Smallpox	Ill. & Kans Kans .	
1645	{ 6 2	Spotted fever Inflam of brain	Ky Ill	
1646	{ B 1	..... Sickness	Kans .. Kans	Parents third cousins Brother of Wife No 1956 and Wife No. 1966
1647	{ B B	..... .....	N. Y ..... N. Y. ....	Sister of Wife No. 414.
1648	{ B —	..... —	S. C —	Brother of Husb No 1700 Not deaf
1649	{ — —	— —	S. C. . . . —	Dead. Not deaf
1650	{ B 1	..... Scarlet fever....	Ham'ln & N. Y. Hamilton ..	Parents cousins

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

Reference number	MARRIAGES				PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.				Deaf Relatives. [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]				
	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children			Brothers and Sisters [Including Per- son recorded]							
			Total	Deaf	Hearing		Unknown	Year of birth		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown
1651	1889	1879	1	—	1	—	{ Husband { Wife	1843 1843	1 5	1 1	4	—	
1652	1889	1887	2	—	1	1	{ Husband { Wife	1843 1859	8 10	2 1	6 9	—	
1653	1891	1883	1	—	1	—	{ Husband { Wife	1857 1858	10 3	1 2	9 1	—	
1654	1889	1876	2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1871 1851	5 4	1 1	4 3	—	
1655	1891	185	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1843 1818	11 4	1 2	8 2	—	Cousin
1656	1890	1885	1	—	1	—	{ Husband { Wife	1873 1857	5 10	1 4	4 6	—	
1657	1889	1888	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1888 1888	1 1	1 1	—	—	
1658	1889	1875	2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1850 1850	6 1	1 5	—	—	
1659	1889		2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1847 1850	9 6	1 1	1 5	—	
1660	1889	1881	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1862 1862	4 2	1 1	3 1	—	
1661	1889	1883	3	—	1	2	{ Husband { Wife	1862 1862	4 10	1 1	3 3	—	
1662	1890		4	—	4	—	{ Husband { Wife	1866 1866	4 1	1 3	—	—	
1663	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1866 1866	5 7	1 1	4 6	—	
1664	1889	1881	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1862 1863	4 6	1 1	3 5	—	
1665	1890	1866	2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1862 1866	11 6	2 1	9 7	—	
1666	1893	1862	2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1831 1835	7 1	4 1	3 —	—	Niece
1667	1889	1876	2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1849 1849	8 1	5 1	3 —	—	
1668	1889		1	—	1	—	{ Husband { Wife	1866 1866	1 2	1 2	—	—	
1669	1889	1889	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1849 1862	8 1	2 1	6 —	—	
1670	1890		1	—	1	—	{ Husband { Wife	1870 1877	1 1	1 1	—	—	2 fourth cousins
1671	1889		2	1	—	1	{ Husband { Wife	1857 1865	6 11	1 4	5 7	—	
1672	1891	1853	2	—	2	—	{ Husband { Wife	1826 1827	10 3	4 1	2 2	4	
1673	1889	1879	1	1	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1852 1854	4 6	1 1	3 5	—	
1674	1890	1884	—	—	—	—	{ Husband { Wife	1854 1860	3 5	1 1	2 4	—	
1675	1889	1879	3	—	3	—	{ Husband { Wife	1859 1858	3 10	2 2	1 8	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
651	{ Inf	Gatherings under ears	London Ohio	
652	{ 6½	Sickness Brain fever	Ohio Ohio	
653	{ 9 2	Meningitis Diphtheria and measles	W Va. Mich C N Y Minn	Sister of Wife No 2578
654	{ 3 B	Cold	Ohio Ohio	Died 1879
655	{ B B		S C S C	Brother of Husband No 1883 Parents cousins Died 1892
656	{ 5 B	Fall	Ill Ill	Sister of Wife No 643 and Husband No 1524
1657	{ — B	—	— Minn	Not deaf
1658	{ 1 —	Sores in head	Minn —	Not deaf
1659	{ 1 2	Sores in head Scarlet fever	Minn Minn	Died 1879
1660	{ 18 3½	Meningitis A fall	— N Y	Educated in hearing schools First marriage second to Wife No 1861 Died 1882
1661	{ 18 10	Meningitis Meningitis	— —	Educated in hearing schools Second marriage, first to Wife No 1660 Educated in hearing schools
1662	{ B —	—	Pa —	Not deaf
1663	{ 2 1½	Inflam of brain	Hartford Hartford.	Died 1845 First marriage, second to Husband No 2935 Died 1868
1664	{ 1½ B	Convulsions	Pa Pa	
1665	{ 1½ 1½	Cold Scarlet fever	Pa La. Ky, & Ind	Brother of Husband No 1729
1666	{ ½ ½	Measles Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Bro of Wife No 4064, Husband No 1608, and Wife No 943
1667	{ B —	—	Pa Pa	Bro of Wife No 1434. Parents second cousins.
1668	{ 2½ B	Sickness	Pa Pa	
1669	{ 2 B	Measles	Mo & Pa W Pa	Third marriage first to Wife No 1618 second to Wife No 1619
1670	{ 12 B	Scarlet fever	Pa	
1671	{ B —	Cong'n of brain	Iowa Iowa	Sister of Husband No 1166
1672	{ B 1½	— Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Bro of Wife No. 1566, Wife No 2231, Wife No 3583. Died 1880 Died 1875.
1673	{ 4 —	Scarlet fever	Mich Mich	
174	{ 3 2½	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Cal. Ind. & Cal	
175	{ 5 B	Scarlet fever ... ..	Mich. Mich.	Brother of Husband No 1763 Parents cousins

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No. of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Person recorded)				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children)
			Total	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1676	1889	1873	4	—	4	—	Husband 1849	5	2	3	—	Parents (No 1826), uncle; great-uncle (Husb No 1824), great-aunt, 8 second cousins (including Husb No 168, Husb No 1825, Husb No 3199); third cousins (including Wife No 1453 and Husb No 3201); 2 four cousins
							Wife 1848	9	2	7	—	
1677	1889	1885	1	—	1	—	Husband 1861	5	2	3	—	. . . . .
							Wife 1861	1	1	—	—	
1678	1890	1883	6	—	6	—	Husband 1823	5	1	4	—	Uncle Cousin of father
							Wife 1832	6	1	5	—	
1679	1889	1880	2	—	2	—	Husband 1841	10	3	7	—	_____
							Wife 1841	10	—	10	—	
1680	1889	1870	3	—	3	—	Husband 1841	7	1	6	—	_____
							Wife 1843	9	5	4	—	
1681	1889	1886	2	—	2	—	Husband 1852	12	1	11	—	_____
							Wife 1864	7	1	6	—	
1682	1890	1861	3	—	1	2	Husband 1817	1	1	—	—	_____
							Wife 1817	11	—	11	—	
1683	1894	1884	5	—	3	2	Husband 1859	4	1	3	—	_____
							Wife 1858	5	2	3	—	
1684	1890	1879	—	—	—	—	Husband 1852	6	1	5	—	_____
							Wife 1859	2	1	1	—	
1685	1890	1868	—	—	—	—	Husband 1819	1	1	—	—	_____
							Wife 1819	1	1	—	—	
1686	1890	1880	3	—	3	—	Husband 1858	12	1	10	1	_____
							Wife 1859	13	1	11	1	
1687	1890	1879	—	—	—	—	Husband 1839	11	5	6	—	Father (Husb No 1824), aunt; cousins (including Husb. No 1 Husb No 3199), 5 second cousins (including Wife No 211, Husb. No 1453, Husb No. 3201 and 3 third cousins
							Wife 1839	8	3	5	—	
1688	1890	1874	9	—	3	—	Husband 1838	10	2	8	—	_____
							Wife 1841	6	2	4	—	
1689	1890	1892	1	—	1	—	Husband 1838	10	2	8	—	_____
							Wife 1857	9	1	8	—	
1690	1889	1861	5	—	5	—	Husband 1838	1	1	—	—	. . . . .
							Wife 1840	12	2	10	—	
1691	1890	1883	1	—	1	—	Husband 1858	6	2	4	—	_____
							Wife 1863	6	1	5	—	
1692	1890	1869	2	—	2	—	Husband 1823	8	1	7	—	_____
							Wife 1824	5	1	4	—	
1693	1890	1865	3	—	3	—	Husband 1838	5	1	4	—	A cousin (Wife No 190) . . . . .
							Wife 1838	9	4	5	—	
1694	1889	—	3	—	3	—	Husband 1825	1	1	—	—	. . . . .
							Wife 1825	—	—	—	—	
1695	1890	1873	2	—	2	—	Husband 1849	13	2	11	—	_____
							Wife 1853	13	1	12	—	
1696	1890	1875	—	—	—	—	Husband 1839	11	5	6	—	Father (Husb. No. 1824); aunt; 5 sons (including Husb No. 1824, 1 No. 3199); 5 second cousins (including Wife No. 211, Husb No 1876, No. 1453, Husb. No. 3201); 3 cousins
							Wife 1839	—	—	—	—	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
1676	B		Ky	Brother of Wife No 211 Died 1887
1677	B	Gathering in ears	Ind	Sister of Husb No 2311
1678	B	Sickness	Ohio Ohio	Brother of Wife No 2278 Died 1877
679	—	—	—	Not at school Not deaf
680	1 1/2 B	Inflam of brain	Ohio Ohio	Sister of Wife No 946 Husb No 475, Husb No 2600, Wife No 4315
681	B 1 1/2	Measles	Mich Ohio	
682	3 —	Scarlet fever	Hartford	Not deaf
683	2 B	Brain fever	N Y N Y	Sister of Wife No 3893
1684	1 1/2 7	Bilious fever and gumline	Mich Mich	Divorced 1883 First marriage second to Wife No 1706 First marriage second to Husb No 2945
685	— 2	Inflam in head	Ohio	Not deaf
1686	4 4	Scarlet fever Scarlet fever	Mo Mo	
687	B		Ky	Second marriage first to Wife No 1696 Brother of Husb No 1825
688	B 2	Nervous fever	Hartford Hartford	Sister of Wife No 1696 First marriage 2d to Wife No 1689 Bro of Wife No 3451 Sister of Wife No 4070 Died 1878
689	B B		Hartford Hartford	Second marriage 1st to Wife No 1688 Brother of Wife No. 3451
1690	1 1/2 1 1/2	Cold	Ohio	Not at school Died 1869 Sister of Wife No 1413
1691	B 4	Scarlet fever	Ky Ky	
1692	4 B	Brain fever	Hartford Hartford	
1693			Ohio Ohio	Sister of Husb No 921
1694	B —		Ohio	Not deaf Died 1888
1695	B 8		Iowa & Coll Iowa	First marriage, second to Wife No 1886 Brother of Wife No 294. Parents cousins Died 1889
1696	B		Ky	Brother of Husb No 1825. First marriage, 2d to Wife No. 1887



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1697	1890	1889	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife	6	1	5	—	—
1698	1890	1878	5	—	5	—	{ Husband 1843 Wife 1858	1 1	1 1			—
1699	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife	1	1			—
1700	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1836 Wife	3 1	3 1			—
1701	1891	1868	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1840 Wife 1846	1 1	1 1			—
1732	1890						{ Husband Wife	1	1			—
1708	1890		3	—	2	1	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1856	1 2	1 2			—
1704	1890	1878	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1851 Wife 1858	14 9	2 1	12 8	—	Nephew Cousin
1705	1890	1882	3	—	3	—	{ Husband 1861 Wife 1860	13 11	2 1	11 10	—	—
1706	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1852 Wife 1863	6 9	1 1	5 8	—	—
1707	1891		1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1848 sev Wife 1852 s v	1 —	sev all	—	—	—
1708	1890						{ Husband 1807 Wife	1	1			—
1709	1890	1886					{ Husband 1852 Wife 1850	2 4	1 1	1 3	—	Aunt
1710	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1813 Wife 1810	5 6	1 4	4 2	—	Niece (Wife No 328) and nephew (Hu No 1653)
1711	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1869 Wife 1860	1 1	1 1			—
1712	1891	1834	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1801 Wife	8 3	3 —	5 3	—	—
1713	1889	1881	1	—	1	—	{ Husband 1855 Wife 1855	7 9	1 2	6 7	—	—
1714	1891		1				{ Husband Wife	1	1			—
1715	1894	1888	3	—	1	2	{ Husband 1859 Wife 1862	9 4	1 1	8 3	—	—
1716	1894	1892	1				{ Husband 1854 Wife 1866	6 2	1 1	5 1	—	—
1717	1890						{ Husband 1811 Wife 1817	1 2	1 2			—
1718	1890	1868	6	—	6	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1847	1 1	1 1			—
1719	1890		—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1837 Wife 1845	4 2	2 2	2	—	—
1720	1890		sev.	—	all.	—	{ Husband 1848 Wife 1852	1 2	1 2			—
1721	1892		1				{ Husband 1881 Wife.	5	1		4	—
1722	1891						{ Husband 1867	3	3	....	....	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness.	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks
1697 {	2	Brain fever	Mo	Not deaf
1698 {	5	Fever	Ind	
	2	Fall ..	Ind	
1699 {	1½	Fever	Norris, Mich	Not deaf
1700 {	B		S C	Brother of Husb No 1648
1701 {	1½	Scarlet fever	N Y	Not deaf
			N Y, Ind., & Tenn	
1702 {	B	..	Ky	
1703 {	7	Dropsy of brain	Ill	
	B		Ill	
1704 {	13	Br'n & spinal fev	Mo	Died 1883
	4	Spotted fever	Mo	
1705 {	7	Meningitis	Mo	
	2½	Meningitis	Mo	
1706 {	1½		Mich	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1684
	1½		Mich	
1707 {	6	Scarlet fever	N. Y	Not deaf.
1708 {	Inf	Sickness	N Y	
1709 {	½	Fright & congestion of brain	Hartford and N Y Imp'd.	Parents second cousins
	B		Hartford	
1710 {	B		Hartford	Died 1868
	3		Hartford	Sister of Husb No 1055 and Wife No 790 Died 1869.
1711 {	3	Sickness	Texas	
			Texas	
1712 {	1		Hartford	Died 1879
				Not deaf
1713 {	12	Scarlet fever	N Y	
	8	Scarlet fever	N Y	
1714 {		..		Uneducated. Died 1891
1715 {	5	Typhoid fever	Ohio	
	1	Brain fever	Ohio	
1716 {	4	Scarlet fever	Pa	
	5	Meningitis.	N Y & N J	
1717 {	1	Sickness.	N Y	Dead
	B		N. Y	First marriage, second to Husb No. 98.
1718 {	3½	Scarlet fever	N. Y	Died 1879.
	6	Measles	Ill	First marriage; second to Husb. No 1482.
1719 {	B		Ala	
	B		Ala	
1720 {	B		Ill	Sister of Husb. No 3782.
			Ill	
1721 {				Died 1892.
1722 {			Miss..	Died 1891.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information.	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters Including Per-son recorded ]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children.]
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing.	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1723	1894	1	—	—	—	1	(Husband 1828 Wife 1835	2 5	2 2	—	—	2 nices (Wife No. 3474 and Wife No. 420 Nephew
1724	1890	2	—	2	—	—	(Husband 1846 Wife 1848	1 7	1 1	6	—	—
1725	1890	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1856 Wife 1849	2 11	2 5	6	—	"Uncle"
1726	1890	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1852 Wife 1852	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1727	1889 1877	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1849 Wife 1842	7 5	1 1	6 4	—	Second cousin
1728	1893 1892	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1867 Wife 1870	1 1	1 1	—	—	Cousin
1729	1891 1856	2	—	2	—	—	(Husband 1824 Wife 1844	11 3	2 —	9 3	—	—
1780	1891 1867	6	—	6	—	—	(Husband 1824 Wife 1844	11 5	2 3	9 2	—	—
1731	1891 1892	5	—	5	—	—	(Husband 1819 Wife 1844	1 sev	1 3	—	—	sev Great grandmother, cousins and othe
1732	1891	4	—	4	—	—	(Husband 1844 Wife 1846	1 2	1 2	—	—	Cousin
1733	1890	sev	—	all	—	—	(Husband 1847 Wife 1847	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1734	1890	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1872 Wife 1872	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1735	1892 1892	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1852 Wife 1852	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1736	1892	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1737	1890	1	—	1	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1738	1890	4	—	4	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1739	1890	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1740	1890	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1741	1892 1892	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—
1742	1890	1	—	1	—	—	(Husband 1856 Wife 1854	6 3	1 1	5 2	—	—
1743	1890 1889	1	—	1	—	—	(Husband 1864 Wife 1863	5 10	1 1	4 9	—	—
1744	1892 1875	1	—	—	1	—	(Husband 1840 Wife 1854	1 8	1 2	1 6	—	Aunt
1745	1890	1	1	—	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 2	1 2	—	—	—
1746	1890	—	—	—	—	—	(Husband 1851 Wife 1851	1 1	1 1	—	—	—

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
723 {	B	--	N. Y. Hartford	Brother of Wife No 3700 Sister of Husb No 4263
724 {	B 6	A fall	Hartford Hartford	Died 1888
725 {	B B		Miss Miss	Sister of Wife No 025 Probably married twice, other marriage to Husb No 2759 Dead
726 {	5	Scarlet fever	Mkh	Dead
727 {	15 1/2 B	Spotted fever	Mich Hartford	Second marriage, first to Husb No 1971
728 {	3	Rising in head Meningitis	Va, Ky & Ken Ky	
729 {	B	-----	Pa	Brother of Husb No 1665 First marriage, second to Wife No 1780 Died 1892 Not deaf First marriage
730 {	B	-----	Pa	Brother of Husb No 1665 Second marriage, first to Wife No 1729 Died 1882 Uneducated Dead
731 {	12 1/2 B	Inflam of brain	Ohio	Died 1887 or 1888 Uneducated Sister of Husb No 2869 Parents cousins
732 {	---	-----	Mo	Not deaf
733 {	B	Cold in head	Ill Ill	Dead Probably first marriage, second to Husb No 380 Sister of Husb No 804 Parents third cousins
734 {	1 1/2	Fever	Ill	Parents third cousins
735 {	9	Spotted fever	Ind	
736 {	13	Croup	Ind	
737 {	4	Scarlet fever	Ill	Not deaf
738 {	---	-----	Ohio	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1739, third to Wife No 1740 Uneducated Dead
739 {	---	-----	Ohio	First marriage, second to Wife No 1738, third to Wife No. 1740 Not deaf Abandoned her husband
740 {	---	-----	Ohio	Third marriage, first to Wife No 1739, second to Wife No 1738 Not deaf Abandoned her husband.
741 {	---	-----	Ky	
742 {	1 3 1/2	Intermit fever Scarlet fever.	Mich. Mich	
743 {	1 1/2 5	Ty'd pneumonia. Meningitis.....	Ky Ky	
744 {	4 B	Fever	Ind. La	
745 {	B	-----	Ky	First marriage, second to Wife No 1746.
746 {	B	-----	Ky	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1745 Not deaf.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES							PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.							Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children )	
Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters (Including Per son recorded )							
			Total.	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown				
1747	1890		4	—	4	—	{Husi and 1832 Wife	6 2	1 2	5	—				
1748	1892		5			5	{Husband Wife	3 1	3 1						
1749	1892		1			1	{Husband 1852 Wife	4	1	3	—				
1750	1893	1891	1			1	{Husband Wife	1 7	1 3	4	—				
1751	1890		2	—	2	—	{Husband 1824 Wife	9	1	8	—				
1752	1890		1	—	1	—	{Husband 1845 Wife	1	1						
1753	1890	1847	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1808 Wife 1808	7 8	1 1	6 7	—				
1754	1890	1867					{Husband 1808 Wife 1814	7 1	1 1	6	—				
1755	1890						{Husband 1808 Wife	7 1	1 1	6	—				
1756	1891	1890	2	—	—	2	{Husband 1868 Wife 1870	5 5	3 1	2 4	—				
1757	1890		2		1	1	{Husband 1861 Wife 1861	2 7	1 1	1 6	—				
1758	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1870 Wife 1871	2 3	2 1	2	—	Nephew partially deaf			
1759	1890						{Husband 1837 Wife 1828	3 1	3 1						
1760	1889		1			1	{Husband Wife 1854	1 4	1 1	3	—				
1761	1890	1849					{Husband Wife 1821	1 4	1 4						
1762	1890	1887	2		1	1	{Husband 1858 Wife 1856	9 10	— 1	7 9	—	Second cousin Second cousin			
1763	1892	1884	1	—	1	—	{Husi and 1856 Wife 1858	3 3	2 2	1 1	—				
1764	1893		3	2		1	{Husband Wife	1	1						
1765	1890						{Husband 1859 Wife 1861	9 13	2 1	7 12	—				
1766	1893	1891	1			1	{Husband Wife 1868	1	1						
1767	1892	1873	7	—	7	—	{Husband 1848 Wife 1855	7 10	1 2	6 8	—				
1768	1891	1891	—	—	—	—	{Husband 1858 Wife 1860	3 6	1 1	2 5	—				
1769	1890	1889	1			1	{Husband 1859 Wife 1863	1 1	1 1			2 cousins (Wife No 183 is one)			
1770	1890		2	—	2	—	{Husband 1813 Wife 1815	4 11	1 3	3 8	—				

.....

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated	Remarks
1747	B		Hartford Tenn	Mother of Husb No 1902
1748			Tenn	
1749	B		Pa	Parents cousins Not deaf
1750	B		Ky Ky	Sister of Husb No 2238
1751	2½	Fever	Hartford	Died 1858 Not deaf
1752	10	Scarlet fever.	Hartford	Not deaf
1753	1	Ulcerat'n in ears	Hartford	First marriage, second to Wife No 1754; third to Wife No 1755
	4	Illness.	Hartford	Died 1862
1754	1	Ulcerat'n in ears	Hartford	Second marriage, first to Wife No. 1753, third to Wife No 1755
	½	Inflam. of head	N. Y	
1755	1	Ulcerat'n in ears	Hartford	Third marriage, first to Wife No 1753, second to Wife No 1754
1756	1	Enlargement of tonsils	Kans	
	2½	Spinal meningitis	Kans	
1757	13	Accident	N Y & Coll	Died 1890
	2½	Scarlet fever	N Y	
1758	B		Ill	Brother of Wife No 1485
	2	Spinal meningitis	Ill	
1759	B	Whoop ng cough.	Ind Ohio.	Brother of Wife No 2864
1760	3		Riehen (Switzerland)	Died 1886 First marriage, second to Husb No. 3449
1761	B		N Y & Canada Jobarie	Semi-mute Sister of Wife No 313 and Wife No 4378.
1762	2	Scarlet fever	N Y.	
	2	A fall. ....	N Y	
1763	4	Mumps. Cold	Mich Ind	Brother of Husb No 1675
1764	—			Not deaf Mother of Wife No. 435
1765	B		N O	
	1	Bronchitis ..	N O	
1766	—			Not deaf.
	15	Disease affecting the eyes.	Horace Mann	
1767	9	Scarlet fever	N O. . . .	
	B		N O . . .	Sister of Husb No. 538.
1768	6	Suspended by feet by nurse in play	Miss & Coll .	
	4	Typhoid fever. .	Miss . . . .	
1769	B		Ill	
	1½	Spinal meningitis	Mo & Ill . . .	
1770	½	Fever.....	Hartford.....	Died 1881
	B		Hartford.....	Sister of Wife No. 795 and Wife No. 1047.

## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

MARRIAGES							PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE						
Reference number	Date of information	Date of marriage	No of Children				Year of birth	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded]				Deaf Relatives [Not including brothers and sisters nor children]	
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown		
1771	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1850 Wife 1848	5 6	1 1	4 5	—	—	
1772	1893		1			1	{ Husband 1853 Wife 1861	1 1	1 1				
1773	1890						{ Husband 1845 Wife 1854	5 1	5 1			Cousins Cousins	
1774	1890						{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1				
1775	1889	see v			all		{ Husband Wife 1810	12	6	6	—	Cousins (including Wife No 1775, Wife No J11 Wife No 3806)	
1776	1889	see v			all		{ Husband 1854 Wife	6	1	5	—		
1777	1890						{ Husband 1815 Wife 1813	1 2	1 2				
1778	1892						{ Husband 1848 Wife 1810	1 1	1 1				
1779	1893	1888	2		1	1	{ Husband 1877 Wife 1869	7 4	1 1	6 3	—		
1780	1890	1890	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1869	7 7	1 1	6 6	—		
1781	1893	1891	1			1	{ Husband 1868 Wife 1862	5 1	2 1	3 1	—		
1782	1892		1			1	{ Husband 1854 Wife	6 1	4 1	2 1	—		
1783	1893	1889	2			2	{ Husband 1870 Wife 1873	6 4	4 1	2 3	—		
1784	1893	1893	—	—	—	—	{ Husband 1877 Wife 1870	4 3	1 1	3 2	—		
1785	1890		6			6	{ Husband 1831 Wife 1827	4 7	2 1	2 6	—	4 cousins	
1786	1890	1869					{ Husband Wife 1800	1 1					
1787	1890		4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1833 Wife 1838	4 5	2 1	2 4	—	4 cousins	
1788	1892	1879	4	—	4	—	{ Husband 1854 Wife 1857	2 1	1 1	—	1		
1789	1890						{ Husband 1855 Wife	11 1	1 1	10	—		
1790	1890	1880	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife 1843	3	1	2	—		
1791	1893	1891					{ Husband 1864 Wife 1869	5 1	1 1	4	—		
1792	1894	1890	1			1	{ Husband 1865 Wife 1868	2 2	2 2				
1793	1892						{ Husband 1853 Wife	7	2	5	—		
1794	1891	1890	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1 1	1 1				

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
1771	{ 2 3	Scarlet fever	N Y N Y	Second marriage, first to a hearing man
1772	{ 5	Fever Spinal fever	Ill Ill	
1773	{ B 8	Fever	Ga Ga	Brother of Wife No 2817 Parents fourth cousins
1774	{	Sickness	Canajoharie	
775	{ — B	— —	— Pa	Not deaf Married his cousin
776	{ 2	A fire-cracker burst in his ear	N Y	Sister of Wife No 961 and Wife No 3806 Dead
777	{ 2 B	Inflam in head	Canajoharie & N Y N Y	
778	{ B 4	Spotted fever.	Ind Ind	
779	{ 4 (2)½	Brain fever Spotted fever	Ill Ill	
780	{ 3 5	Brain fever	Norris & Ill Norris	
781	{ B 2	Scarlet fever	Pa Pa	Brother of Wife No 3430 Married also to Husb No 685
782	{ B		N Y	Brother of Husb No 1783, Husb No 1615, Wife No 3018.
783	{ B 3	Fall	N Y N Y	Brother of Husb No 1615, Husb No 1782, Wife No 3018.
784	{ 5½ 1½	Spinal meningitis Cerebro-sp men	Mo & St Louis Day St Louis Day	
785	{ B		Ky & Ia Ill & Ia	Brother of Husb No 1787
786	{ — B	— —	— Ia	Not deaf
787	{ B 2	Cholera infantum	Ia & Ky Ia & Ill	Brother of Husb No 1785
788	{ 17 12	Brain fever Spotted fever	Ind Ind	
789	{ ½		Ia Ia	
790	{ — B	— —	— Hartford	Not deaf Separated
791	{ B ...	...	N. Y N. Y Impr'd	First marriage; second to Wife No 1917 Died 1893.
792	{ 3 2	Disease in ears. Catarrh	Wis Wis	
793	{ B		N Y	
794	{	.....	Tenn Tenn	



## Tabular Statement of Marriages.

## MARRIAGES.

## PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE.

Reference number.	Date of information	Date of marriage.	No of Children				Year of birth.	Brothers and Sisters [Including Person recorded.]				Deaf Relatives (Not including brothers and sisters nor children )
			Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown.		Total	Deaf	Hearing	Unknown	
1795	1890						{ Husband Wife	1864	1	1		
1796	1890		2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1862	1	1		Cousin
1797	1890		12	—	12	—	{ Husband Wife	1842 1846	1 6	1 2	4	Second cousin
1798	1892	1888	1	—	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1855 1856	1 1	1 1		
1799	1890		3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1842	1	1		
1800	1893	1891	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1861 1865	2 2	1 1	1	
1801	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1864	1	1		Grandfather
1802	1892						{ Husband Wife	1850 1851	2 1	2 1		
1803	1890						{ Husband Wife	1848 1855	1 1	1 1		
1804	1891						{ Husband Wife	1813	1	1		
1806	1893	1892					{ Husband Wife	1864 1858	1 2	1 2		
1806	1890	1864					{ Husband Wife	1836	6	1	5	
1807	1890	1874	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1838 1848	4 4	2 3	2 1	Cousins
1808	1894	1893	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1838 1866	4 1	2 1	2	Cousins
1809	1898	1892					{ Husband Wife	1869	11	2	9	
1810	1893		1			1	{ Husband Wife	1871	1	1		
1811	1894		4		1	3	{ Husband Wife	1862	1	1		
1812	1891	1887	2	—	2	—	{ Husband Wife	1858 1864	4 4	2 4	2	
1813	1890	1850	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1812	10	5	5	3 grand nephews and 2 grand-nieces
1814	1890	1876	3	—	3	—	{ Husband Wife	1850	3	1	2	
1815	1892	1892	—	—	—	—	{ Husband Wife	1866 1866	1 3	1 1	2	2 cousins of father Distant relatives
1816	1892	1888	3		1	2	{ Husband Wife	185— 1860	7 6	2 1	5 4	Niece
1817	1894	1891	1			1	{ Husband Wife	1865 1863	7 1	1 1	6	
1818	1894		2	1	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1813 1813	6 10	1 1	5 9	Cousin
1819	1890		2	1	1	—	{ Husband Wife	1837 1842	2 4	1 2	1 2	Parents (No. 1816), cousin. Nephew
1820	1890						{ Husband Wife	1807	4	1	3	

PARTNERS IN MARRIAGE

Reference number	Age of deafness	Assigned cause of deafness.	School for the deaf where educated.	Remarks.
1795 {	— B	—	Mo	Not deaf
1796 {	2 —	Spotted fever	Ky & Coll	Not deaf
1797 {	1 4	Cold Fall	Ind Ill	Sister of Wife No 1160
1798 {	B 3	Scarlet fever	Ind Ind .	
1799 {	B —	—	Mich	Not deaf
1800 {	B 1½	Cerebro-sp men	N Y N Y	
1801 {	— 2	— Cong'n of brain	— Clarke	Not deaf
1802 {	B B		Ind Ind	Brother of Wife No 1004.
803 {	9 1½	Mumps Cold	Ill & Coll Kans & Mo	Dead First marriage, second to Husb No 2587.
804 {	2½	Sickness	N Y	Dead
805 {	2	Scrofula	Ill Ill	
806 {	6	Scarlet fever	Hartford .....	Separated Not deaf
807 {	B B		N Y N Y	First marriage, second to Wife No 1808. Sister of Husb No 4200 Parents distantly related.
808 {	B B		N Y N Y Imp'd	Second marriage, first to Wife No 1807. Second marriage, 1st to Husb No 2841
809 {	2	Fits	Mich	
810 {	7½	Spotted fever	Ind	Not deaf
811 {	— 2	— Spotted fever	— Ia	Not deaf Separated 1894.
812 {	B B	....	Cal Cal.	
813 {	—	—	Ky	Not deaf Sister of Husb No 1556 and Husb. No. 1557
814 {	12	Scarlet fever	Hart'd & Coll	Not deaf
815 {	1½ 1½	Whooping cough. Measles	Clarke C. N Y	
816 {	1½ B	Scalded .. ..	Ohio Ohio	Brother of Wife No. 171.
817 {	4 3½	Scarlet fever Cerebro-sp men	Kendall & Coll Kendall & S C	
818 {	2 B	Illness. ...	Hartford . Hartford .	Died 1891 Mother of Husb. No 1819. Died 1883
819 {	B 1	..... Scarlet fever ...	Hartford Hartford...	Sister of Wife No. 4263
820 {	—	—	—	Not deaf. Died 1844.
820 {	—	Scarlet fever ....	Hartford ...	